Greetings to all of you. Allow me to introduce myself as your new President of the University Faculty Senate (UFS). I have been a faculty member at Binghamton for nearly 28 years, teaching in the Department of Geological Studies. I was director of the Envi Studies program for the last decade. My research area is geomorphology—the study of earth surface processes. I am particularly interested in floods, flood hazard assessment, and responses of rivers to human interventions (such as dams), as well as New York’s glacial legacy. I have been actively involved in faculty governance at Binghamton and at the State level for more than a dozen years. And it is a great honor to have been elected to be President of the UFS and to represent you in many dealings with SUNY System Administration.

One of my main goals for the first year of my Presidency is to visit all of the State-operated campuses in order to meet with campus governance leaders, faculty senates or assemblies, and faculty leaders. So, over the year you may see me on your campus. I hope to visit half of the campuses this fall and the other half early in the spring semester (weather permitting, of course). I also have reached out to our fellow faculty leaders in UUP, and new UUP President Fred Kowal and I have been communicating regularly. To that end, we attended each other’s fall meetings as special guests. What with all of the initiatives and other issues facing SUNY, we agree that it is important that faculty and professional staff speak with as united a voice as our respective groups deem possible.

My first few months as UFS President have been busy, what with familiarizing myself with some of the layers of System Administration with which I was unfamiliar, as well as staying abreast of all the rapidly evolving SUNY initiatives. There’s a lot on which to update you.

Open SUNY

Several pieces of the broad Open SUNY initiative will roll out in January. The positive potential of that initiative is clear to me: support for faculty to develop and implement high-quality online education, hybrid courses, remote experiential learning; support for students including tutoring, technical support and other services done at a scale that can offer opportunities for many students not currently enrolled in SUNY to pursue their higher education objectives. At the same time, there is the potential for negative outcomes: loss of local faculty control of its curriculum as students “shop” for courses; inconsistent course quality, and even central control over what courses can be offered online. With care and attention by all of us, none of these (or other) negative outcomes need to occur, and Open SUNY can reach its potential to offer more opportunities for more students from New York and elsewhere.

Open SUNY will include a host of aspects, from enhanced online education to MOOCs to prior learning assessment to competency-based credit. For example, SUNY signed a contract with Coursera over the summer to use their platform for MOOCs.
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should campuses and faculty wish. SUNY has yet to work out a mechanism for approval, oversight, credit, transfer, use of other institutions’ MOOC offerings, campus versus System control, etc. Prior Learning Assessment, expansion of online courses and online degrees, cross-registration of courses to allow students from one campus to take an online course from another seamlessly—these are just a few of the other elements. With so many parts to this initiative, and an aggressive timetable, it is important that faculty be involved and vigilant. Accordingly, we have established an ad hoc UFS Committee on Open SUNY. This group will report to the Senate and to the campuses (through their governance leaders) on emerging issues related to the initiative.

START-UP NY

Again, a rapidly moving topic. The legislation passed in June essentially asks campuses to provide space for companies to create new jobs in New York State, with significant tax-free advantages. I hope that faculty on your campuses have been working with your campus President to ensure that whatever is proposed or planned, the projects are consonant with the “academic mission” of the campus—a stipulation in the legislation. Of course, what that means is subject to wide interpretation. In any event, Presidents have been told to deliver some “wins” for the Governor by January, and many are working to do so. I have sent talking points to the Campus Governance Leaders (CGLs) to help them take a proactive position on this.

LICH and SUNY Downstate

Downstate Medical University has been facing financial difficulties for some time, exacerbated by the take-over of the Long Island College Hospital (LICH) in Brooklyn two years ago. In March 2013, facing significant losses, the Board of Trustees voted to close LICH in order to help shore up the finances of Downstate and its principal hospital. Litigation has kept SUNY from closing LICH. Two Brooklyn judges have weighed in, and Bill deBlasio rode the issue to the Democratic nomination for mayor of New York. LICH had shut down its emergency room and most other parts of the hospital by July, but had to reopen the emergency room and some other services in September. And LICH has lost an estimated $89 million for the year by the end of October. Meanwhile, SUNY has undertaken significant steps to guarantee the longevity of University Hospital in Brooklyn (Downstate Medical University’s main teaching hospital). It remains unclear how all of this will end, how/if SUNY will be able to close the hospital, the effects on jobs, and what will be the financial impact on the rest of the SUNY campuses.

CNSE-UAlbany Separation

The Board of Trustees passed a resolution at a special July meeting to separate the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering from the University at Albany. Exactly what form this will take is uncertain, although it was covered in the media as setting up the 65th SUNY campus. The Chancellor has set up a number of administrative workgroups to sort out various issues in the separation. How this will impact both UAlbany and CNSE remains to be worked out.

SUNY Budget for 2014-15

We’ll be moving into the 4th year of “rational tuition” and “maintenance of effort.” But the latter isn’t exactly what’s been happening; instead, what we’ve seen is no cut to SUNY’s State allocation, but also no maintenance of the budget in real terms (such as inflationary costs and raises). So SUNY is working on framing a request for additional funding. As I write this in early November, the nature of this request hasn’t been finalized, but likely it will involve some kind of incremental increases based on performance measures. We’ll be keeping a close look at this as it unfolds.

Shared Services

The initiative to share services across SUNY campuses continues to move forward. The focus is on six “back-room” areas designed to save money across the system (including purchasing, IT, and others). This initiative likely will continue to produce some tensions between campus autonomy and “systemness,” although the emphasis has shifted to sharing of items for which savings can be made at scale more than sharing of personnel.

Educator Preparation

The Board of Trustees passed a resolution in September aligning SUNY policies in our schools of education with recommendations as yet unfinalized from the Governor’s New NY Education Reform Commission. This includes a minimum 3.0 or top 30% of high school class entrance requirement; use of GRE and SAT scores required for admission; comparative report card of student results; and 35% of professional course credits in clinical practice. Deans of Education schools were given a few days notice to provide feedback, but no such opportunity was presented to the UFS or the Faculty Council of Community Colleges. We pushed the Board of Trustees to delay implementation until 2015-16 and to require that SUNY work to identify adequate place-ment opportunities, but that was as far as we could move the resolution. The UFS passed two resolutions at our Fall Plenary that addressed both the process and the substance of this Board resolution, urging that implementation be delayed and that an advisory body develop a less arbitrary (in our view) set of criteria to enhance the quality of teacher candidates.

Student Mobility Initiative

The development of the initiative was essentially completed by the formal delivery of the Memorandum to Presidents early in the summer. This year, campuses are expected to review their programs (majors, transfer information) to align with the seamless transfer requirements. But differences in interpretation of language—whether specifically-identified courses should be universally required in the first two years of a major, and how much flexibility campuses will have with credit caps—remain. The UFS is working closely with the Interim Provost to resolve these issues so that we can have a system that provides students with truly seamless transfer while at the same time retaining faculty control over the curriculum on each campus. This will likely result in consensus on core courses in some majors, while others will have less structured transfer paths that still identify for students what the typical course background is that they need to pursue a major.

SUNY Voices

This is an initiative to enhance shared governance—faculty, staff, students, administrators, trustees—across SUNY. A very effective workshop on shared governance for campus governance leaders was held in June. This will be expanded in 2014 to include student leaders. And we are moving forward with the first SUNY Voices Shared Governance conference in April to examine the role of shared governance in the 21st century university. You’ll hear more about this later this year.

Presidential Initiatives

I’m particularly excited about two initiatives this year. The Research Foundation has established a working group, including faculty from the various sectors, to develop a funding model to support undergraduate research (initially in the STEM fields) at (large) scale across SUNY and to re-imagine the nature of STEM courses, particularly at the introductory level. A second initiative is one that has been hanging around for a couple of years: sustainability education. I’m looking forward to a workshop for May 2014 that will bring together teachers of sustainability from across the System to consider best practices and possible strategies for improving and integrating principles of sustainability into the curriculum.

So, as you can see, there is much going on at SUNY these days—many things that will affect us directly and indirectly on our campuses. I welcome your input, questions, comments, concerns, and advice.
There is a great deal of much-deserved buzz surrounding the upcoming launch of Open SUNY in early 2014. Worldwide, colleges and universities and the people they serve—from students and parents to faculty and staff and business and industry—are looking to SUNY as we aim to shape the future digital learning. Your voice—the perspectives and insight of the SUNY faculty and professional staff—will be critical as Open SUNY moves forward.

The calls nationally for innovation and new opportunities that increase access to a college degree while shrinking the amount of time and money spent have never been more prevalent. In New York, alone, nearly 8.8 million adults—55.6 percent of the state’s adult population—do not have even a high school degree, let alone a college degree. Many of them are military veterans, displaced workers, and single mothers. Many of them have family obligations and work schedules that have prevented them from attending college in its traditional form.

SUNY has made digital-enabled learning a priority, in part, to make college accessible to these groups. Open SUNY will allow us to reach New Yorkers in ways we have not been able to reach them before—in their homes and communities, and on their time, adapting to their schedules. Think about what this kind of flexibility will mean for the population. Tens of thousands of would-be students could become actual students who, through the power of Open SUNY, will be able to position themselves to enhance their lives, and the lives of their loved ones, by setting and achieving new career goals and driving our economy.

Additionally, Open SUNY builds upon our history of innovative instruction and online teaching by getting us all on the same page and creating a forum for us to learn from one another. SUNY’s current online environment was created by the strategic and tactical decisions of individual campuses and moved along with central supports like the SUNY Learning Network (SLN) and other University-wide programs. And while the result has been an environment rich in online course offerings and even degree programs, the system is poor in cross registration, collaborative programming, and degree ladder opportunities.

We are proud to be on the cusp of launching Open SUNY, which will answer the many challenges before us as we continue to set the national model for public higher education and meet the educational needs of more New Yorkers. The initiative’s success, however, is directly dependent upon you, the SUNY faculty and professional staff.

SUNY’s treasured content and education experts from every possible field have put us in a position to create Open SUNY, and though the launch is just months away, your continued feedback, support, and partnership in the system’s delivery of Open SUNY will be essential throughout next year, as we fine-tune the program, and well beyond its short-term implementation.

In the spirit of shared governance and continued partnership, we will all need to work together to tackle tough issues, build effective consortia, and get more creative about delivering effective student services, for starters. Over the next few months, we will work together with you and your campus leadership to design a center for online teaching excellence that will help coordinate all things Open SUNY and provide the support we know are necessary for this initiative to achieve its goals.

In the meantime, I encourage you to visit http://open.suny.edu, tell us your thoughts and share your contact information, so that we can keep you apprised as Open SUNY moves forward.

As a member of the SUNY faculty and professional staff while this exciting initiative puts down its roots across the state, I hope that each of you will take the opportunity become involved in the development and implementation of Open SUNY, which has the potential to be the world’s premier digital-enabled learning environment, powered by the best, most qualified online teaching corps in the world.

Open SUNY is a big idea designed to fill big needs and you, the faculty and professional staff, are key to its ultimate success.

---

FROM THE CHANCELLOR
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FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

There is a movement on the expansion of STEM programs within the State University of New York that is following the national trend towards producing skilled graduates in the most cutting edge fields of business and industry.

In 2010, under the leadership of Chancellor Zimpher, SUNY launched the Empire State STEM Learning Network. This is a system-wide effort which is bringing together the existing 5 regional hubs and the 3 others that are forming to share resources, develop partnerships and bolster a collaboration of teaching and learning in the STEM concentrations.

And last year, in partnership with Battelle and 13 other state STEM education networks, SUNY helped launch STEMx, a national consortium that will connect the existing networks and combine resources, best practices and policy strength to grow and strengthen STEM education for students and teachers in the relevant disciplines.

With 2.4 million STEM job openings anticipated before 2018, our campuses have embraced this effort in a number of ways, with an increased number of programs and curriculum tracks, outreach and training on career paths and collaboration with elementary and middle school institutions to ensure that STEM is a focus on the whole education pipeline.

One of the most unique things happening has been at the System level through our Office of Diversity Equity and Inclusion, which sponsors an annual STEM conference to bring awareness to the importance of broadening the participation in science, technology, engineering and math fields. This brings into particular focus a commitment to linking up these programs with our growing population of under-represented students.

And we are being recognized for it on both the state and national level. President Obama has issued a goal of adding one million STEM graduates to the national workforce over the next decade. That, Continued on page 4
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The opportunities for all entities, from business and government to education, are filling out the formula of access, completion and success that will serve to create graduates that will fill those STEM positions and embark on a job path that is not only sustainable but critical to the future of our nation.

We know we need a highly trained workforce to take the jobs of tomorrow – programs like P-Tech and other early college high schools are focused on linking both lower and higher ed curriculum to high tech careers.

In fact, the P-Tech (Pathways in Technology, an early college high school in Brooklyn) model where SUNY provides coaching and assistance is in the process of being expanded though a state-wide partnership formed by Governor Cuomo. Just a few weeks ago, I joined the Governor and President Obama at an event celebrating P-Tech in Brooklyn and the fact that New York is the first state in the nation to make this expansion.

Greetings! As I write this message I have just returned from the University Faculty Senate (UFS) meeting at SUNY Maritime—my first in quite some time when I was not serving as a member of the Executive Committee but rather in my interim role as Provost. My thanks go to the UFS leadership team and to our gracious hosts at Maritime for an informative, energizing meeting. I have always taken great pride in my role as a System liaison to the UFS, and have been so pleased to play an active role in SUNY’s commitment to shared governance. I appreciate the support and guidance I have received from the Senate over the past two months as I stepped out of that role to help transition the Office of the Provost to a new leader.

The past two months have been incredibly busy, much busier than I had anticipated, even after four years! I was quickly reminded that the faster the pace, the more sensitive and powerful role communication plays; not only in shared governance but in our everyday work as managers and team members and in our respective contributions to the achievement of SUNY goals. As I head into my third month in this role, I have a much clearer lens through which I can see our priorities, our challenges, and our tremendous opportunities.

We are at a critically important time in our ability as a system to bring to fruition long-term goals that will have a positive impact on student completion and success. I take seriously my charge from the Chancellor and Trustees to both stay the course and address new challenges and opportunities as they arise, particularly with respect to our seamless transfer policy and our Open SUNY initiative. Both are extensive, detailed efforts that have been led by faculty most recently via the Student Mobility Steering Committee, the Chancellor’s Online Education Advisory Team and the Provost’s Open SUNY Advisory Committee. Because of the complexity of both projects, the work to date was not completed overnight; in fact, it was years in the making. As we continue with implementation, new issues will no doubt arise, but I know we can address them together.

Staying the Course: Our Commitment to Student Completion and Success

Seamless Transfer

We owe a tremendous thanks to the UFS and the Faculty Council for Community Colleges (FCCC) and to hundreds of faculty members who participated in the research, analysis, dialogue, debate, and compromise to get where we are today. They provided us with a foundation for what I believe is the strongest seamless transfer policy in the country. We have already accomplished so much. After the passing of the Board of Trustees’ resolution on seamless transfer, the Provost’s office worked in consultation with the University community to develop a guiding Memorandum to Presidents (MTP) on implementation. What strikes me as so important about this MTP is that it builds on previous SUNY policy and guidance related to general education and transfer, on common student learning outcomes in SUNY General Education Requirement (SUNYGER) courses identified by SUNY faculty, as well as Transfer Paths for dozens of undergraduate majors created by associate and baccalaureate faculty. The MTP is available online at:


Once the MTP was finalized, the Provost’s office immediately began working with campus Chief Academic Officers and faculty on next steps. We are committed to working in partnership with the SUNY community on implementation. Campus liaisons in the Office of Academic Programs, Planning and Assessment are available to serve as a sounding board and resource throughout the implementation process. In fact, staff developed a Frequently Asked Questions resource document to address common questions. The FAQ has been posted online (http://www.suny.edu/provost/academic_affairs/SeamlessTransferFAQ.cfm) and we will continue to update it as we move forward. We had requests for more detail on the waiver process and in response staff developed a guiding form.

Most recently, we have had a request from faculty to explore the transfer paths. We always envisioned expanding the transfer paths and our desire is to ensure that they are as effective as possible. To that end, we will be creating a special online community in the SUNY Commons for faculty in respective disciplines to provide me with additional feedback on the transfer paths, including ideas for expanding the paths to other majors. The paths are vitally important planning tools for students and their families. More information about the SUNY Commons opportunity will be shared soon.

I know that I have said this repeatedly and that Provost Lavallee has said this before me, but it deserves another mention here. We know that questions and even unexpected challenges will come up during implementation. With an initiative of this size and scope, some implementation bumbs are to be expected. However, these challenges are not a reason to move backward or to stop progress; they are an opportunity for us to work together to develop solutions. The seamless transfer policy is about better support for our students, about enhancing completion and success—principles I know we all share. In the most simple of terms, we owe it to our students
to get this done.
We are so fortunate that in addition to our seamless transfer policy we are also implementing complementary initiatives that will positively impact completion and success:

Open SUNY
The expansion of our online courses and degree programs has a direct link to access, completion and success by bringing necessary courses to students no matter where they are located. There are other opportunities too through Open SUNY, including increased professional development for faculty and dynamic student supports. I am so pleased to see the strong engagement of faculty in the roll-out of this initiative.

Degree Works
SUNY’s customized version of this degree audit and planning tool will allow students and advisors to monitor their progress toward degree completion via an easy-to-use online tool. I am very pleased to report that all SUNY campuses are participating in this important effort.

Strategic Enrollment Management
We will continue our efforts to support the development or expansion of academic programs that prepare students for the most in-demand career opportunities.

This is SUNY’s time to emerge as the place to be for New York State students and students from across the country and world.

FROM THE INTERIM VICE CHANCELLOR FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

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

Maintaining Momentum: Academic and Management Excellence

SUNY has experienced a resurgence over the past several years, due in no small part to the financial stability provided to the University through the passage and implementation of the NY SUNY 2020 Challenge Grant Act in June 2011. The Act, which introduced annual predictable tuition increases and provides the “maintenance of effort” for State support, allows New York students and their families the ability to plan more prudently for the cost of a college education. In addition, with increased attention on obtaining administrative efficiencies through shared services, SUNY campuses are provided the means to direct resources to instructional activity and to support services critical to student success.

2013-14: Excellence in Resource Stewardship
The 2013-14 Enacted Budget contained several significant items which will continue to strengthen SUNY.
First, the NY SUNY 2020 Challenge Grant Act continues, with an additional $55M to be awarded in Round III. The program is designed to enhance the academic mission of the qualifying campuses and to help strengthen their role as regional economic development generators. The Rational Tuition Policy component of the Act is now in its third year, providing additional revenues for reinvestment at all our campuses.
Second, the Residence Hall Program underwent a major restructuring: the bonded debt related to this program has been removed from the State bond cap, which may allow for future investments to support SUNY educational facilities. Bonds sold under the newly restructured program will be supported solely by revenues generated by dormitory rents, fees, and charges. The first sale under this program was completed in August 2013 and resulted in $175M in funding that will support the progress of over 100 projects and provide cash flow into fall 2014.
Third, the Governor and the Legislature approved the Start-up NY initiative, which provides for tax-free zones on SUNY and private college campuses. The Start-up NY program will impact many of our campuses and strengthen partnerships with business and industry, while enhancing our ability to spur economic development throughout New York State. Companies participating in this program will be required to support the host institution’s academic mission, and would be exempted from paying property, sales or income taxes for 10 years. Employees that work at companies in tax-free zones would not have to pay state income taxes for five years.
Finally, the budget provided $148M in capital appropriations to support NY-SUNY 2020-related projects at University at Albany and Stony Brook University, as well as $38.5M in State match for several community college projects. However, requested funding was not provided for new initiatives and critical maintenance projects at our State-operated and statutory campuses.
We continue the prudent use of our resources while expanding our management efficiencies and strategic sourcing initiatives. In the current year, incremental tuition revenues will total $91M, most of which will support hiring of additional faculty and staff, as well as contractual obligations, program support, and student scholarships. We continue to ensure that access and affordability are protected. In 2013-14, we are projecting the provision of more than $36M in tuition credit to our students to cover the gap between current SUNY tuition and the maximum TAP award.

Meeting Present and Future Challenges
Despite recent budgetary improvement in our situation, uncertainties and challenges remain on many fronts. Our academic medical programs and the three SUNY hospitals at Brooklyn, Syracuse, and Stony Brook remain at a competitive disadvantage due to their State entity status. The roots of the crisis faced by Downstate Medical lie in its inability to compete favorably with private sector hospitals, its patient characteristics, as well as an overall crisis facing health care in Brooklyn. SUNY will continue working towards a viable solution to the Downstate crisis based on the sustainability plan submitted to the Governor and the Legislature in June, while the legal situation related to the closure of the Long Island College Hospital takes its course.
While the New York State and national economies have improved, we still have not returned to pre-recession levels. At the time of this writing, it is unclear what the long-term impact of the federal government shutdown and potential debt ceiling crisis will have on SUNY. The Enacted 2013-14 Budget eliminated a State-wide deficit of $1.4B through various savings strategies and without imposing new taxes. According to the first quarter Financial Plan Update, the General Fund budget gap for 2014-15 is now projected at $1.74 billion, a slight improvement from the Enacted Budget Financial Plan. For FY 2016 and 2017, General Fund gaps are projected at approximately $2.9B annually.
Given these uncertainties, we must continue in our efforts to do more with fewer resources. Our shared services initiative has garnered national recognition; our
Continued on page 6
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Campuses have generated over $20 million in savings since the launch of the initiative in 2011.

Looking Ahead to 2014-15

The Power of SUNY signifies our collective resolve to achieve greater productivity and effectiveness, while improving the lives of New York State citizens. Our ability to deliver on this promise has never been in doubt. But we need to do more to promote strategic investment in SUNY’s core educational and research mission as we drive economic development throughout New York State.

That the prospect of New York economic well-being is closely linked with the robustness of its higher education institutions is undeniable. The role being played by SUNY has been acknowledged in several of the Governor’s recent initiatives, some of which have been mentioned above. We are continually refining our strategies to convey our story to our external stakeholders; investing in SUNY institutions is the best way to grow the New York economy and to ensure that the finest educated citizenry for the 21st Century knowledge economy is available here in New York State.

The 2014-15 budget request will seek support for the University’s costs-to-continue, as well as targeted investments. We will focus our efforts on securing State support for contractual and inflationary increases such as the recently ratified University Union Professionals (UUP) contract, as well as sufficient campus revenue appropriations to utilize all campus-derived revenues (including those related to the Rational Tuition Policy).

The hospitals’ financial position continues to be precarious. As mentioned above, we will continue to seek a sustainable solution to the Downstate/LICH situation consistent with the sustainability plan which has been accepted by the Executive and the Legislature. We plan to continue engaging all stakeholders and insure that the community’s access to health care will be protected.

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.

Detailed information on the University’s formal budget request will be available on the SUNY website following the November meeting of the Board of Trustees.

The Year Ahead

As the single recognized voice of the over 467,000 students in SUNY, the Student Assembly’s mission is to empower students to seek continued access to quality, affordable higher education. Over the past five years, the Student Assembly has played a key role in major SUNY initiatives including the efforts that led to rational tuition and the maintenance of effort called for in the Governor’s NY SUNY 2020. Without the efforts of the students, many of these policies would not have come to fruition.

Students continue to play a pivotal role in the policy making process in the SUNY system thanks to the efforts of Chancellor Zimpher and others that value student participation in the system-wide policy process. It is important that students continue to play a key role in developing policies that affect them. To that end, one of this year’s goals is to try and find out exactly where students fit in the “shared governance” equation.

Improving Organizational Effectiveness

While the SUNY system and the students it serves have changed over the past five to ten years, the Student Assembly has remained fairly static. With limited resources and a cumbersome structure, there is an increased need to look into the overall effectiveness of the organization’s operations. In order to better serve the students, we need to have a structure that is nimble and much easier to adapt to the changing times.

The Executive Committee voted to establish the President’s Task Force on Organizational Structure to review the standing policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees as well as the Student Assembly bylaws to make recommendations on ways the effectiveness of the organization can be improved. The task force includes students from each of the different sectors as well as liaisons from SUNY System Administration and the University Faculty Senate.

SUNY System-wide Advocacy

As part of the Student Assembly job to advocate, every year we identify a set of priorities that we consider at our Fall Conference during our General Assembly meeting. These are issues that we then advocate for throughout the year. This year, we have chosen to focus on the areas of Academic Affairs, Diversity, Equity & Inclusion, and Veterans.

Academic Affairs

• Advising on all campuses, incorporate Open SUNY/SUNY Online
• Training faculty online & easy credit transfer
• Creating a list of each campuses advisement resources

Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion

• Increase transparency between campuses with resources
  o create website data base of resources
  o obtain list of previously compiled resources

Veterans Affairs

• Improving processes for identifying Veterans in the SUNY system
• Adding GI Bill/Veteran section to SmartTrack
• Training for school certifying officials on best practices
• In-state Tuition rates for students that are veterans

State Legislative Advocacy

In addition to system-wide priorities, we also develop a set of legislative priorities that we spend time advocating to our state government officials throughout the year, culminating with our day of advocacy and rally at the State Capital.

Community College Base Aid

• Secure a commitment for a Rational Aid approach for Community College funding for the next 5 years.
• Increase of $150 per Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) for the next 5 years.

New York State Tuition Assistance Program

• Increase maximum award for undergraduate students.
• Reinstate graduate student awards.
• Expand access to TAP for all students.

Veterans Tuition

• Waive residency requirements for veterans using their VA GI-Bill benefits OR currently serving in any component of the United States Armed Forces regardless of duty location or previous residency status.

Although none of these priorities are set in stone yet and subject to change pending the decisions of the General Assembly, I think this gives a good sense of the various things that students have an interest and will continue to advocate for. We are looking forward to a productive and ultimately fulfilling year.
Within the SUNY system, Maritime College rightfully claims "unique" as its descriptor. One reason is the College’s magnificent campus located on a peninsula where the East River meets Long Island Sound. Ships and pleasure boats sail these waters while above, automobile traffic hums across the Throgs Neck Bridge and the occasional jet descends toward nearby JFK or LaGuardia airports.

Besides its unique setting, Maritime also has an unusual history. Begun in 1874 aboard the USS St. Mary, what was then known as the New York Nautical School would become part of the SUNY System by 1947. Like the tide’s ebb and flow, waves of inadequate funding, uncertain enrollment, resignations and moves to abolish the school seemed never-ending, but alumni and area merchants fought untringly to enlist state support and keep the school afloat. Most importantly, the federal government’s creation of the U.S. Maritime Commission in 1936 to revitalize the shipping industry, and the completion of a new pier at Fort Schuyler in the east Bronx, provided a permanent setting. Built during Andrew Jackson’s presidency and commandeered as a Union hospital during the Civil War, historic Fort Schuyler needed major repair. Through the Works Progress Administration and the intervention of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the restoration was completed and Fort Schuyler was dedicated as the NY State Merchant Marine Academy in 1938. Steadily, the Academy progressed toward higher enrollment, a more rigorous curriculum, more modern training ships, and the renovation of classrooms.

By April 1946, boasting a faculty comprised of both credentialed academicians and licensed merchant mariners, the NY State Merchant Marine Academy obtained permission from then Gov. Thomas Dewey to award the degree of Bachelor of Maritime Science. With its unique meshing of vocational and academic strands, this Maritime Academy gained entrance into the SUNY System in 1949 as Maritime College and began granting the Bachelor of Science in four areas: Marine transportation, Marine engineering, science, and humanities. In the mid-fifties, three additional programs were initiated and approved: Marine Operations, Marine engineering design and construction (naval architecture), and Marine business administration. Necessary facilities were added, new dorms built, the Fort renovated to include Maritime’s prize-winning Stephen B. Luce Library and the Museum of the Brooklyn Navy Yard. In 1969 a Graduate program leading to a Master’s degree in Marine Transportation Management—the first of its kind in the United States—met with approval.

Today, Maritime’s pattern of evolutionary change continues. Academic programs have expanded and facilities have been upgraded to meet changing needs. A new state-of-the-art academic building is nearing completion, and both students and faculty look forward to classrooms and labs fitted with current and emerging technology. Enrollment has grown from 600 to nearly 1,800 over the last decade. Factors contributing to this growth include the opening up of the campus to “civilian” students; stronger outreach efforts to recruit and incorporate more women into traditionally male-dominated career paths; and developing programs in conjunction with overseas universities. New courses such as Irish Literature and Constitutional Law have been approved, a Law Minor for undergraduates and a graduate program in Maritime Studies have been developed, and internships related to the maritime industry have been created. Additionally, Maritime’s traditional summer sea term has grown from 45 to 90 days. For each of three summers, cadets studying for the Coast Guard license gain not only valuable experience at sea but also the privilege of sampling European and other cultures during visits to ports such as Dublin and Cobh, Ireland; Liverpool, England; Ostia, Trieste and Naples, Italy; Valentia, Malta; Gibraltar; St. John’s, Newfoundland; New Orleans, Louisiana; San Miguel, Azores; Reykjavik, Iceland; Palma and Mallorca, Spain; Piraeus and Andros, Greece.

The Maritime faculty has continued to develop and refine expertise in very diverse areas of scholarship and inquiry. For example: Professor Mark Meierowitz has written and lectured extensively on Turkish politics and was awarded a SUNY Levin Fellowship to teach at a Turkish university; Professor Richard Burke was recently invited to Giglio, Italy to observe and report on the Costa Concordia’s restoration; and Professor Maryellen Keefe’s critical biography Casual Affairs: The Life and Fiction of Sally Benson (a prolific short story and Hollywood screenplay writer) is forthcoming in June 2014 from SUNY Press.

International programs involving students from Turkey, the Bahamas, Brazil, China, and Norway have been established. Athletics has gained greater prominence with both men’s and women’s teams taking first place within their Division. As academics have grown in importance, students have been increasingly initiated into the cultural wonders of New York City—museums, theater, Botanical and Zoological sites. Lastly, a Navy ROTC unit housed at Maritime has welcomed students from nearby Fordham and Columbia Universities while some Maritime students attend Army ROTC at Fordham University and others take advantage of Air Force ROTC at Manhattan College in the Riverdale section of the Bronx.

Looking back on alumni achievements, one is awed by their uniqueness. Who would imagine, for instance, that individuals as unique as Edward Villella—world-renowned star of the ballet—and Commander Scott Kelly—famous for his achievements in space—should claim Maritime College as their Alma Mater? Maritime is rightfully proud of all its graduates and their diverse talents and accomplishments for they augur well for future success. And tomorrow? At the moment searches are underway for a new Provost and a new President. Meanwhile, the dedication, pride, and commitment to learning and service that have characterized Maritime College for more than sixty years will continue to flourish and bear fruit for our city, state, and global community. "Fair winds and following seas!"
**Program and Awards Committee**

**Dennis Showers, Chair**  
**SUNY Distinguished Service Professor**  
**SUNY Geneseo**

**Charge**

As the shortest and (at first blush) simplest of the charges to the University Faculty Senate’s Standing Committees, the responsibilities for Programs and Awards (P&A) is: “The Committee will concern itself with the enhancement of inter-campus educational and scholarly interests of the faculty through the development and strengthening of University-wide programs, grants, and awards.” However, this seemingly simple charge has not kept the Programs and Awards Committee from being effective in key activities and changing with the transformations of SUNY’s mission and its bearing on faculty roles and rewards. The Committee is a standing committee of the University Faculty Senate and also interfaces with the Awards Committee of the Faculty Council of the Community Colleges (FCCC). A member of the UFS Programs and Awards Committee serves as a liaison on the FCCC Awards Committee and vice versa.

**General Activities**

**Conversations in the Disciplines Program**

The bulk of the verbiage in the charge describes the committee’s responsibility to administer the Conversations in the Disciplines (CID) program. This long-running program was established to fund intercampus conferences that would bring together scholars from within and outside of SUNY to share research and professional developments in their fields with the intent of enhancing instruction and research for participating campuses. Proposals for grants of up to $5,000 each focus on scholarly and creative development rather than administrative, curricular, or instructional matters. Since 1965 nearly 500 programs have been supported in traditional and emerging disciplines. In the past two years, the CID program received additional support to align two awards with the strategic initiatives of the Chancellor’s Six Big Ideas: sustainability and entrepreneurial activities.

The P&A Committee manages the program by issuing a call for proposals early in the calendar year. After individual review by its members, the committee convenes to determine which proposals the modest budget of the program will be able to support. One or more System liaisons support the work of the Committee by helping to organize and conduct the review process and by serving as a point of contact to answer questions or help applicants put together competitive proposals.

Gradually over the past few years, the processes of submitting applications and conducting the reviews have moved to an online system. Led by the extensive work of Kulathur (Raj) Rajaseethupathy, the on-line system was first established at Brockport where he is a professor in the Computer Science Department. With the system developed and launched there it was moved to SUNY System servers and is available at [http://www.sunny.edu/provost/cid/](http://www.sunny.edu/provost/cid/).

Successful CID proposals must demonstrate that they facilitate a scholarly exchange and that the activities are innovative and timely. The program must be realistic in its goals and plans but are not in support of meetings that would occur without the support of the CID program. The qualifications of the participants are important and the conversation should clearly demonstrate its benefits to the participating individuals and campuses.

In its most recent annual awards through the Conversations in the Disciplines, the program has supported eight programs at six different campuses. These included programs on the present state and future of public history in New York, the medieval contexts and global “intertexts” of Boccaccio, the impact on scholarship of “digital humanities,” and landscape as a concept across multiple disciplines. The program funded a meeting on climate and storms as to the resiliency of the Great Lakes and a student-services oriented conference on research and practice to reduce student substance abuse. In 2013 an award went to examine an interdisciplinary approach to environmental, economic and social sustainability as the Energy-Smart New York Conversation. The Entrepreneurial Century Conversation was awarded for a dialog for creativity and innovation in the biomedical sciences.

**Chancellor’s Awards for Excellence**

The other substantial responsibility of the committee is to create, review and oversee the implementation of the Chancellor’s Awards for Excellence and Distinguished Faculty Ranks. The Chancellor’s Awards are System-level honors that encourage and recognize the pursuit and attainment of superior professional achievements in Faculty Service, Librarianship, Professional Service, Teaching, and Scholarship and Creative Activities. On the home page for these programs, the description states “These programs underscore SUNY’s commitment to sustaining intellectual vibrancy, advancing the boundaries of knowledge, providing the highest quality of instruction, and serving the public good. Through these awards, SUNY publicly proclaims its pride in the accomplishment and personal dedication of its instructional faculty, librarians and professional staff across its campuses.”

In the 2012-13 academic year the Programs and Awards Committee developed two new awards in response to a perceived need for categories of service deserving recognition. The Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Adjunct Teaching seeks to identify high-quality, sustained teaching by adjunct faculty at the undergraduate, graduate, and/or professional level. The subcommittee tasked to draft the guidelines worked out a definition of adjunct eligibility, determined the limits for campus nominations, and defined the characteristics of an appropriate candidate. While the nomination process parallels the selection of candidates for the long-established Excellence in Teaching award, the guidelines for the Excellence in Adjunct Teaching award had to take into consideration the distinctive role of part-time instructors at community colleges, comprehensive colleges and graduate degree institutions. The subcommittee considered the obligations of adjunct faculty for advising, classroom instruction and the emerging on-line learning environments.

The newly-developed SUNY Shared Governance Award is a departure for the Chancellor’s Awards system as it is designated to be given to a campus rather than an individual. With only one award per year given across the system, the award will identify and recognize outstanding contributions to the advancement of shared governance. The award is meant to be a reminder of SUNY’s commitment to a team partnership in faculty-administrative collaboration supporting the long-standing and widespread tradition of faculty input into decision-making processes in institutions of higher education. A challenge to the subcommittee in drafting the guidelines for the award was to define the collective activities describing effective shared governance. In final form, that definition appears on the web site as “Shared Governance is defined as administration/faculty/staff/student cooperation that is mutually recognized as effective engagement of the local governance structures and elected representatives on issues and policies that impact SUNY. Whenver possible, this cooperation should include shared and timely decision making, shared accountability, collaborative dialogue, and open communication.” The hope is that as the award moves forward, the recognized campuses will serve as role models for other campuses to emulate in the area of shared decision-making and collaboration.

The Committee also has an on-going responsibility to fine tune the requirements and the
language describing the various Chancellor’s awards. With a slightly different vocabulary in the different sectors and institutions comprising the SUNY System, the words used to describe the criteria, eligibility and processes for the Chancellor’s awards sometimes exclude deserving individuals. The committee monitors for such situations and regularly updates and clarifies the information that assures fair and equal consideration of all potential candidates.

**Distinguished Ranks Programs**

According to the web site [http://www.suny.edu/facultySenate/DistRank.cfm](http://www.suny.edu/facultySenate/DistRank.cfm), “Distinguished Faculty Rank programs encourage ongoing commitment to excellence, kindle intellectual vibrancy, elevate the standards of instruction and enrich contributions to public service. They demonstrate the State University’s pride and gratitude for the consummate professionalism, the groundbreaking scholarship, the exceptional instruction and the breadth and significance of service contributions of its faculty.”

The Distinguished ranks are the “highest system tribute conferred upon SUNY faculty” and are divided among exceptional performance in research (Distinguished Professor), teaching (Distinguished Teaching Professor), service (Distinguished Service Professor) and librarianship (Distinguished Librarian.) The “Distinguished” designation constitutes an academic rank and is conferred by the Board of Trustees. Starting in 2012, Distinguished Faculty are automatically included in the membership of the Distinguished Academy, which is working to increase the commitment and activity among these individuals to use their talents to the advantage of the whole System.

The Programs and Awards Committee historically has crafted the language of the guidelines and developed the communication processes whereby the Distinguished Ranks program has been implemented. The Committee works with one or more System liaisons to support the implementation of the Distinguished Ranks processes.

**Current Activities**

For the Conversations in the Disciplines program, the Committee is looking to develop additional ways to make the usefulness of CIDs more evident and long-lasting, and to integrate them more fully with the Chancellor’s strategic plan. This will include plans to promote the awards more vigorously and support the Chancellor’s goal of “celebrating” the awards for SUNY and for the individual campuses.

For these two new Chancellor’s Awards, the Committee is looking to assist with and monitor the processes to assure these honors are being granted as they were envisioned. The Committee is considering a response to concerns of insufficient faculty involvement in the assembly and operation of the campus nominations committees for Excellence awards and Distinguished Ranks nominations. The Committee has also been asked to consider the feasibility of a new award for faculty work in cooperative learning, experiential learning, and internships or whether these activities can be incorporated into existing awards by revising the criteria. The committee has had and will continue discussions of the role of on-line instruction and how it fits into the teaching and service awards.

For all programs the Committee is looking to strengthen and systematize publicity about these awards and programs before and after awards are made. The Committee needs to gather information about how these systems operate on different campuses across SUNY to assure that each program is meeting its intended goals.

**Benefits**

There are many benefits for SUNY faculty that result from the work of the Programs and Awards Committee. This work gives one insights into the different processes that the member can take back and help his or her campus work productively to promote candidates for awards. Participating in the CID award process helps create an understanding of the breadth and depth of scholarly and teaching activities that are going on across the SUNY System. As with all UFS committees it is an opportunity to work with colleagues from across the System and to interface with the corresponding colleagues in the FCCC. And lastly, it is a chance to help shape awards which serve as incentives to current and future faculty who aspire to continuous improvement and high achievements in all areas of responsibility of the professoriate.

---

**The Cost of Higher Education and Faculty Teaching Loads**

There is a general consensus that higher education is an important element in the effort to improve the quality of life in the United States as well as to enhance its political status and increase its economic competitiveness on the global stage. President Obama has made that point repeatedly in his State of the Union addresses and in various budget messages. Thomas Friedman, a columnist for the New York Times, among others, has consistently argued that increasing the opportunity of more young people to attain a college education is an essential element of life in the 21st century and should be a major national project.

However, there has been no dearth of legitimate concern over the rising costs of a college education that have made it more problematic for segments of the population. The media and the professional literature abound with articles about it. President Obama has used his bully pulpit, and meetings with heads of universities and university systems (including Chancellor Nancy Zimpher) to indicate his concern about this issue. However, a recent article by Richard Perez-Pena in the New York Times (October 25, 2013) indicates that the actual average cost of education at private nonprofit colleges have been generally stable over the past decade, though there is certainly variation among these institutions. Most of the concern is expressed about the “sticker price” of a college education, but, he argues, when you take into account the discounts, grants, and tax breaks that are available to students, the actual cost “has barely changed over the last decade...” The major increase in the real cost of a college education occurred during the 1980s and 1990s.

For public colleges and universities, net prices have in fact risen over the past decade, especially since the “great recession,” as states have substantially reduced aid to these institutions. However, Perez-Pena points out that “this year’s sticker price increases are the smallest in decades.” Nonetheless, there are many families struggling to pay the costs of a college education for their children, especially those at the lower end of the middle class.

The media is replete with the argument that one of the major factors that have led to an increase in the cost of a college education is that faculty teach-
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ing loads are too low, which, consequently, requires the hiring of additional faculty who would be unnecessary if faculty taught more classes. This line of thinking is exemplified by an article in the March 21, 2013 issue of Inside Higher Education, entitled “Are Professors selling students short?” and one in the March 21, 2013 issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education, entitled “Lighter teaching loads for faculty contribute to rising college costs, report says.”

After reading those articles and considering the considerable attention in the media and political realm about college costs, I asked D. Bruce Johnstone, former president of Buffalo State College, former chancellor of the State University of New York, and an expert in the financing of higher education to provide an analysis of the issues currently involved in financing public institutions of higher education. His article focuses on three types of changes that would need to be considered: increasing instructional responsibilities of faculty, reducing administrative expenditures, and changing the way knowledge is conveyed and students learn. In this issue, I thought it appropriate to address the first of the issues that Johnstone addresses: increasing instructional responsibilities of faculty. Consequently, I asked a colleague in each of the 5 “sectors” of SUNY to provide an article on the likely effects of an increase in faculty teaching loads on the range of professional responsibilities for faculty in their type of institution. Four of the five responded with thoughtful articles on this topic. These articles, and the one by D. Bruce Johnstone, comprise the mini-symposium in the section below. The two other issues Johnstone raises in his paper will be the subject of mini-symposia in future issues of the Bulletin.

[Editors’ note: This section provides a mechanism for communication among faculty, professional staff, and administrators on issues that are relevant to SUNY as a system or to higher education in general. The views and comments expressed here are not necessarily those of the editors, the Executive Committee, or the University Faculty Senate. Submissions for or comments about articles in this section should be addressed to the editors and should generally not exceed 2,000 words.]

Reflections on Ken O’Brien’s Term as President of the University Faculty Senate

Nancy L. Zimpher
Chancellor
The State University of New York

Dr. Kenneth P. O’Brien, a member of SUNY’s teaching faculty for more than 30 years and immediate past-president of the University Faculty Senate (UFS), joined the Board of Trustees July 1, 2009, just months after I began my own tenure as chancellor of SUNY.

Though our paths inevitably crossed on multiple occasions, my first close interaction with Ken was on the SUNY at 60 book project. Understandably, with his background in history and knowledge of the system, Ken had been tasked with co-editing the book that was to mark SUNY’s 60-year anniversary. Not surprisingly, it was a task he conducted simultaneously with great verve and ease. Throughout the process, I came to learn that Ken had an impeccable fundamental understanding of SUNY. He is a true expert in the system’s history and inner-workings and, to his credit, that is evident in the final SUNY at 60 product.

As the designated faculty representative during the most formative period of SUNY’s new strategic plan, Ken was also naturally cast to lead several charges throughout the process, ultimately serving on the Strategic Planning Steering Committee as well as the Education Pipeline and Student Enrollment Management and Mobility workgroups. After the plan’s launch, Ken was also critical in the development of eight different teams and task forces. These were challenging roles and Ken filled them with his usual grace, keenly striking the right balance between professor and policy-maker, and ensuring that the final plan would benefit each of SUNY’s diverse audiences. Ken’s ability to time and again find that balance is one of several characteristics he possesses that made ours an ideal working relationship as we lifted up shared governance as a key component of the country’s largest system of higher education. Ken is highly observant and passionately inclusive of the different perspectives that inform SUNY’s decision-making. And he has a way of representing our various stakeholders fairly, accurately, and candidly – a challenging combination to be sure.

He is also timely and consistent in his actions. These characteristics are always present with Ken, and I am certain they have served him well throughout his career. Importantly for our purposes, they have changed the face of shared governance at SUNY, setting a higher standard for collaboration and engagement among us.

Ken’s leadership has transformed and improved our processes for presidential searches, general education requirements, strategic enrollment, student mobility, strategic planning, and online education, to name a few. Through it all, Ken has never lost sight of his passions for the arts and research, making the most of his various SUNY posts to support our faculty and student art shows, showcase campus research annually in Albany, and help to form and define the role of SUNY’s first Distinguished Faculty Academy. Fortunately, Ken continues his leadership role beyond UFS, as he currently chairs the Provost’s Open SUNY Advisory Council.

In his four years as president of the UFS, Ken accomplished so much, with such dedication to SUNY and to the faculty he represents. Thank you, Ken, for your outstanding leadership and unwavering partnership as UFS president.
The American public research university has been caught in a decades-long era of rising costs and declining public funding, ameliorated only by internal reallocations, a loss of tenure and tenure-track faculty positions, aggressive fund raising, and very high tuition increases. In light of all indicators that both state and federal funding will continue to be badly stressed (Grapevine 2012, Johnstone 2012), a central question is how should states and state system universities to shift more and more of the increasing costs onto parents and students are compelling states and state systems of higher education to consider ways to roll back the costly instructional paradigm of at least some colleges and universities. While it would be unnecessary, inappropriate, and educationally destructive to attempt literally to change a less distinctive research university into a comprehensive college, it should be possible in most states to decertify manifestly low-performing and/or redundant Ph.D. programs (as some states and state systems and individual universities have already done). It may also be possible to adjust the states’ or the state higher education systems’ appropriation formulas to increase rewards for successful undergraduate instruction and raise the scholarly standards for the high level of state revenues needed to support the low quality teaching loads and other expenses of a research-oriented instructional paradigm. This might encourage, although not mandate, the less research-productive departments, faculties, and even entire institutions to move in the direction of the more teaching-oriented (and less costly) institutions. With such a change, the very low teaching loads and high research expectations—along with the commensurately high costs of this faculty time, in addition to the extensive and expensive academic support in the forms of graduate assistants, technicians, and the like—could, in theory, be reserved to fewer, rather than ever more, public institutions. Such a step would suggest that the United States can no longer afford hundreds of public research universities, all supported by increasingly fragile state taxes and tuition fees, and all attempting to conform to the traditional research university scholarly reward system and instructional paradigm.

To the same end of increasing the instructional productivity of some university faculty, a more appropriate and feasible change might be a greater differentiation not so much of institutions, but of the faculty workload expectations within public research universities. By fairly and sensitively differentiating the workload expectations of research university faculty, some might be expected to be productive in their research and be given the time away from teaching to maximize this output (as well as the continued mentoring of Ph.D.s and post-docs). Others might be expected mainly to teach and given heavier teaching loads—but commensurately released from the expectation to continually produce significant research. In time, some faculty could be hired, promoted, and well rewarded for teaching the three and four course loads that many universities used to feature, and other faculty would be promoted, and rewarded to produce the highest quality scholarship, year after year, with minimal classroom teaching expectations. Such a change would be heavily contested by the academic staff, who would view such differentiation as opening the door to increasing all faculty workloads, infringing on academic freedom, and altering fundamentally the nature of the profession that they have worked so hard to enter. And the systematic differentiation of workload expectations carries the seeds of seriously weakening the quite appropriate scholarly expectations of all research university faculty (indeed, of faculty in virtually all kinds of colleges and universities). Furthermore, such a practice can be construed as making the teaching of an additional class or two a penalty for what a department chair, dean or even a faculty committee might consider insufficiently scholarly research. At the same time, if the underfunding of public research universities is to continue, and if the shift of costs from state governments to parents and students is to level off, then solutions to the worsening university austerity must
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be found mainly on the expendi-
ture side. And if the shift from
regular (i.e. tenured and tenure
track) faculty to part-time,
adjunct, and other decidedly
irregular faculty has an upper
limit, then some increase in
some regular faculty teaching
loads is undisputedly a way that
may be better for the student.

Significantly reducing non-
instructional administrative
expenditures

Faculty (and probably most
students, politicians, and the
general public) would prefer to
reduce and re-balance universi-
ty expenditures by reducing
administration (although admin-
istration can mean very differ-
ent things to different parties).
There is no question but that
administrative costs have risen
sharply relative to strictly
instructional expenditures,
making profound changes—that is,
reductions—in administrative
costs a very tempting target to
solve the financial problems of
public research universities.
Such expenditures, however,
include a number of greatly dif-
fering institutional activities, all
of which will have their defend-
ers, and some of which may be
difficult if not impossible to
cut—or if cut, may carry a com-
mensurate (and self-defeating)
loss of revenue or loss of quali-
ty. For example, the cost to
recruit and matriculate a class of
sufficient size and academic
stature (which is desired by the
faculty) is expensive, and the
competition for academically
able undergraduates is intensi-
fying. The cost of fundraising
has risen greatly in all US pub-
lc colleges and universities. Yet
it takes money to raise money,
and philanthropy is becoming
increasingly important to sup-
plement insufficient state sup-
port and to lessen the reliance on
continually surging tuition fees.
Greater fund-raising effi-
ciency might well be possible,
but budget cuts to university
development offices are proba-
bly self-defeating and unlikely.

Similarly, the costs of informa-
tion technology has risen dra-
matically; yet it would be
extremely difficult to undo the
high and continuously rising
expenditures on academic and
administrative computing, includ-
ing the provision of computing
labs, technical assistance to fac-
ulty and students alike, and the
kind of high-speed computing
necessary to remain competitive
in scientific, engineering, and
bio-medical research.

University business and
accounting offices have
increased staff and expenditures
in recent years. Yet federal and
state governments and university
governing boards have become
much more much more insistent upon finan-
cial accountability, which is
expensive. Financial penalties for
improper use of government
funds or for scientific miscon-
duct are also heavy. So too are
the costs of insurance against
lawsuits in litigious America,
where the injury or death of a
student, a medical malpractice
suit against the university hospi-
tal, or a charge of employment
discrimination can cost millions
dollars. And either way—the
cost of avoidance or the cost of
the risk—ultimately impact
instructional budgets.

Intercolligate athletics is a
favorite target of those who per-
ceive wasteful non-academic
expenditures—and thus of those
who would solve the financial
inefficiency on the expenditure side
without cuts to the instructional
programs. Big time, or want-to-
be-big-time, intercollegiate ath-
letics is enormously expensive. A
very few teams of a very few
universities actually bring net
revenue to their universities as
most of the profits from football
and basketball, if there be any,
are simply spent on other teams
which do not bring in revenue.
Supporters of intercollegiate ath-
letics will claim that the return—
some of it financial—to intercol-
legiate athletics, at least to the
successful universities, lies in
the enhanced alumni support,
general public relations, and
attraction to potential students.
But the combination of increas-
ing financial austerity of the uni-
versities, the very great expense
of intercollegiate athletics, plus
the instances of corruption and
athletic malfeasance that contin-
ue, suggest that a slowing or
reduction of athletic expendi-
tures in most US public research
universities is nearly inevitable,
although the loss of alumni and
general community support may
negate some of the financial
gains. And just as increases in
faculty teaching loads or student
recruiting budgets would be at
least somewhat acceptable if
they were imposed on all col-
leges and universities so that no
single institution would lose rel-
ative standing, very large reduc-
tions in intercollegiate athletics
budgets would also be possible
by imposing on all universities or
at least on all universities in the
same athletic conference). But
in both cases, the absence of a
single governmental ministry to
impose such profound solutions
on all institutions of higher edu-
cation such that none would be
singularly advantaged is the rea-
son that no single institution,
and probably no single higher
educational system, will be the
first to make such dramatic cuts.

The administrative expendi-
tures that remain candidates for
significant reduction, then, are
largely associated with public
relations, human resources,
intercollegiate athletics, and stu-
dent services, including the
costs of student activities,
recreation, career services, and
the like. But much of the low-
hanging fruit of excessive
administration has already,
in most public research universi-
ties, been cut, and more cuts
will undoubtedly be made.
Whether the conceivable addi-
tional cuts can properly be
performed, profound, or even
restructuring, is less clear.

Changing the way knowledge is conveyed and students learn

In the traditional university
instructional paradigm, under-
graduate students are instructed
mainly in classes meeting twice,
and occasionally three times a
week (but rarely for undergradu-
ates in the late afternoons, or on
Fridays, and never on Satur-
days) for 25 weeks semes-
ters a year, with a great deal of
free, or non-learning, time, at
least for undergraduates, in the
academic day, week, and year.
In this paradigm, students accumu-
late credits that can, at some
point—theoretically after four
years, but frequently (and
increasingly) after five, six, or
seven years—be turned in for a
degree.

One way to increase the pro-
ductivity of learning, then, is to
reduce excessive course taking
and bring the time-to-degree
back to a normative four years.
But universities in search of a
truly profound cost-saving
change in the instructional para-
digm might go far beyond this
goal and seek ways for most
undergraduates to earn a bache-
lor’s degree in three years—like
most students in the UK and
more and more in Continental
Europe. This might be accom-
plished with a combination of a
slight alteration of required
credits for the bachelor’s
degree, better advising and
counseling for the incoming stu-
dent, more Advanced Placement
and International Baccalaureate
credits carried to the university
from the secondary schools,
more use of and possibly a
requirement of) year-round cal-
endars, and less tolerance for
the repetition, unnecessary part-
time study, and aimless curricu-
lar wandering about that is alto-
gether too common among
American undergraduates.

A considerably more dramat-
ic alteration of the traditional
instructional paradigm would be
to move from the current para-
digm, in which time, or the dura-
tion of the course module, is the
constant (e.g. 14 or so weeks for
a three credit course) and the
amount of learning (and the
grade) is allowed to vary by stu-
dent. Instead, colleges and uni-
versities could set the content to
be learned as the constant, and
allow the duration of study to
vary. In such model, the bright
and diligent might learn the pre-
scribed content quickly, and
those less bright or less diligent
or more distracted would pre-
sumably take longer. But all
would learn essentially the same
content. And when that content
was mastered to a sufficient
level the student would move on
to the next module of learning.
Such an instructional paradigm
is built on self-paced learning,
which has become dramatically
more feasible with the advent of
accessible and affordable e-
learning. The recent onslaught
of Massive Open On-line Courses, or MOOCS, hold out the promise of hundreds of thousands and even millions of students throughout the world—needing only an institution of some kind to credibly attest to the actual learning and to grant the degree (The chronicle of Higher Education, 2012). Thus, some substantial portion of what we think of as the undergraduate curriculum of our research universities (both public and private) could as well be taught and learned on-line—whether from the university’s own faculty, or faculty from anywhere in the world who are capable of teaching. The undergraduate faculty of the research university, then, might be responsible for stipulating what is to be learned, suggesting where to find the instruction, assessing the learning, and assisting individual students when needed—but no longer having the primary responsibility for the teaching, at least not in the traditional instructional paradigm.

Finally, if such a radically new undergraduate instructional paradigm should require a far more academically prepared and motivated student, a related and also controversial change would be to limit undergraduate enrollments in public research universities to the academically prepared and motivated that can best learn in these accelerated ways. For university systems, this might mean diverting more beginning undergraduates to comprehensive colleges and community colleges where they could be similarly immersed in new instructional modalities, but would also receive more assistance in the learning process, and retain more traditional courses and access to their teachers. Public research universities, then, might become far more open to upper division transfers, and commensurately less accommodating to the academically less prepared and less motivated freshman. A problem this scenario is that it could diminish the pressure on public research universities to advance equity and to work to diminish the intergenerational transmission of academic interest, ambition, and preparedness.

Conclusion: The Prospect of Profound Change in the US Public Research University

For all the financial austerity that has impacted, and will likely continue to impact, public higher education generally and public research universities especially, the likelihood of public research universities or public university systems turning to these kinds of profound changes remains uncertain. This conclusion may disappoint the reader looking for a definitive answer—or at least for a more aggressive defense of the public research university as worthy of much more generous public funding. But we are not alone. Throughout the rich, industrialized world, public colleges and universities are experiencing the same kind of worsening financial austerity brought on by the higher education’s surging costs and revenue needs and political and practical limitations on the likely sources for these needed revenues. It is also quite clear that there are at least conceivable solutions to this worsening austerity that would retain most of the traditional instructional paradigms and avoid drastic, disruptive, profound changes in the ways that faculty have traditionally taught or that students have traditionally learned. But most solutions, whether profound or more-of-the-same, and whether on the expense or the revenue sides, face significant organizational, legal, and political obstacles. For example: Federal solutions: The long run fiscal condition of public higher education could theoretically be eased by the federal government not funding public colleges and universities directly, or even by funding more generously financial assistance to students, but by relieving the states from some of the fiscally unsustainable future financial obligations to pensions and health care—which in turn could eventually solve much of the state’s financial problems and improve the likelihood of stable university funding. However, the worsening (2013) political paralysis in the United states over taxation and the surging long run costs of health care, Social Security, and pensions makes such a solution unlikely, at least in the immediate future—and, of course, there is no guarantee that public higher education, much less public research universities, would benefit.

Major reductions in the budgets of intercollegiate athletics, public relations, mid-level administrators, and so-called merit scholarships: As noted above, these kinds of expenditures are fuelled and maintained by the highly competitive nature of research universities, including the competition for top faculty and for the most academically able students and the reluctance of any single university or system to be the first to seek major savings in these areas.

Reductions in the costs of student living: Public colleges and universities could theoretically ease the burden of what might have to be even higher tuition fees with significant reductions in the cost of institutionally-provided food, lodging, and other services to reduce the overall expense of a year’s worth of university education. However, very many students at public research universities are already living at home or living off-campus at lower costs. And many students and their families are demanding ever more lavish and expensive lodging and food even as they complain about the rising cost of colleges and universities. Again, the highly competitive nature of selective colleges and universities, public and private, lessens the incentive for public research universities to significantly lower the perceived quality of their food and lodging and other institutionally-provided elements of student life apart from the classroom.

Reversing so-called mission creep: States and state higher education systems could—again in theory—more strongly resist, and even begin to reverse, the transformation of public colleges and universities that once featured excellent and cost-effective teaching institutions into aspiring research universities for which neither their faculty nor their students may be ready—and for which there may be little need. However, such a policy will be opposed by institutions (and their faculty, students, and alumni as well as by their local politicians) who, understandably if unfortunately, associate institutional status with an orientation to research and scholarly reputation.

Reducing the high cost of research university faculty: States and state higher education systems might attempt to raise the research productivity standards for the very costly heavy teaching loads currently granted to virtually all research university faculty and allow differential workload expectations. As mentioned above, however, the resistance from university faculty would be fierce, and the actual savings might be minimal.

Moving toward three-year bachelor’s degrees: The improvement in public college and university finances from the three-year bachelor’s degree could theoretically be two-fold. First, the overall number of instructional credit hours would presumably drop and require fewer faculty and staff for the same number of admitted students. Second, a three-year degree would allow alternative tuition pricing policies and might allow higher annual tuition fees without necessarily costing more to the student and family. However, the steady increase in the number of college-level credits earned in high school via Advanced Placement and the International baccalaureate has yet to yield large numbers of American undergraduates finishing in three years. Nor have the opportunities that have long existed for year-round study. So the three-year bachelor’s degree remains an intriguing possibility. But even today, employers and graduate schools complain about the insufficient learning of the current four-year bachelor’s degrees, and any move by state governments or systems to mandate three-year bachelor’s degrees would almost certainly be assailed as reducing quality. And again, the fiercely competi-
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tive nature of US higher education, the quest for the most academically able undergraduates, and the fact that so few students have been pressing for faster completion of their undergraduate degrees or earlier entry into the job market suggest that public universities and state systems will be hesitant to mandate the three-year bachelor’s degree.

Salvation on the revenue side by greatly increased private philanthropy: Public universities in the United States have greatly increased their revenue from philanthropy and will undoubtedly continue to do so. The National Institute for Education Statistics (2012) reported philanthropic gifts to public four-year colleges and universities in 2008-09 totaling nearly $216.5 billion (not counting returns taken in that fiscal year from endowments), which was about 2.6 percent of all revenue from all sources. Public research universities were the principal recipients. But even among research universities, the amounts per university are uneven. Much of the charitable revenue is restricted to such university activities and departments as scholarships, hospitals, intercollegiate athletics, and capital projects: in short, an important source of supplemental revenue for some universities and some recipient offices, but not a major source of revenue for the core instructional budgets. Furthermore, most donors like to give to make a positive difference, such as for a new building or scholarships that will attract better students; donors are less likely to give simply to “fill in” for diminishing state revenues.

Thus, the financial austerity that is plaguing universities in the United States and in many other countries is likely to continue. And the truly profound changes in the traditional research university instructional paradigm—such as the university of the future, where all instruction is via open access e-learning, and the physical campus becomes less and less important—while theoretically feasible and likely to be manifested in a few private universities, are not likely to replace the more familiar, if somewhat poorer, universities we have come to know, at least in the United States.
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When Norm Goodman approached me to write an article about faculty workload from the perspective of the statutory and specialized sector I readily agreed, but with a few caveats, most importantly the diversity of the sector.

This sector includes the contract colleges at Cornell (Agriculture and Life Sciences, Human Ecology, Industrial and Labor Relations, Veterinary Medicine), the College of Ceramics administered by Alfred University, and the state-operated Environmental Science and Forestry, Maritime, and SUNYIT. Several in the sector, including the schools at Cornell and ESF offer doctoral programs and have faculty expectations commonly found at the university centers but with funding and structural differences from the state-operated university centers. With respect to the colleges at Cornell, that university provides much of the arts and science coursework for undergraduate students at the contract colleges. At ESF, a considerable portion of the undergraduate arts and science instruction is contracted to Syracuse University. In recent years at Ceramics, programs in ceramic arts and ceramics engineering have been more tightly integrated (some would argue inappropriately so) with other offerings at Alfred University.

Maritime and SUNYIT are completely state-operated, and though both have relatively narrow missions, they have much in common with the comprehensive colleges but both lack the programs in education found elsewhere in the comprehensive sector.

Recognizing the diversity of the sector, it is almost impossible to generalize observations across the colleges in the sector, and hence my remarks are limited to what I have seen at SUNYIT. I make no representation that what has occurred here is typical of patterns elsewhere in the sector or elsewhere in SUNY.

I am now in my fortieth year at SUNYIT and my campus has undergone considerable change in that time. Until 2003 we were an upper-division and master’s institution, for undergraduates requiring a minimum of 56 credits prior to admission. In 2003 we began to admit freshmen into selected undergraduate programs and almost all of our bachelor’s programs now admit freshmen. Having said that, in any given year freshmen account for only about 10% of overall enrollment. Bachelor’s programs lead to the Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Arts, or Bachelor of Business Administration degrees. SUNYIT does not offer associate degrees, and over the last two decades it has converted remaining Bachelor of Technology programs to the Bachelor of Science degree.

At SUNYIT almost all undergraduate programs are on a four-credit system (meeting four clock hours per week), graduate programs are on a three-credit system (meeting three clock hours per week), and faculty are nominally on a three-three course load. Throughout my memory that goes back to the mid-1970s, there have always been differences in the way lab sections are counted with the science departments using one approach and the engineering technology departments using a completely different approach. Universally, however, a full undergraduate course (carrying four credits) and a full graduate course (carrying three credits) have been equated. Thus, in a given semester, some faculty teach three undergraduate courses for a total of twelve credits, some teach two undergraduate and one graduate for a total of eleven credits, some teach two graduate and one undergraduate for total of ten credits, and rarely some teach three graduate courses for total of nine credits.

While, at first blush, it may appear that some faculty can “game” the system by teaching primarily or exclusively graduate courses, graduate faculty have extra responsibilities that usually go unrecognized and uncompensated. Like the proverbial spaghetti sauce commercial, participation in thesis committees, or serving as a project or thesis advisor, is simply an ingredient in the sauce that represents what it is that we do. I can recall one of my departmental colleagues bemoaning the fact that he regularly takes on six to ten graduate projects or theses per semester yet it never “counts” as part of his workload in the sense that no amount of project or thesis direction results in a course load reduction (or extra service compensation) in my department.

As graduate enrollment grows this becomes a real challenge, and departments at SUNYIT have found different means of addressing it. One mechanism that has been increasingly used is to require, encourage, or allow the substitution of a three-credit course and a three-credit project for a six-credit thesis. Projects require less supervision and faculty time than a thesis does, and student enrollment in an additional class is more easily quantified.
and recognized. Is the additional graduate course and smaller project a better culminating experience for the master’s student? For some it may make no difference; for those continuing on to a doctoral program the thesis may well be the better preparation. Several of the graduate programs at SUNYIT have completely forsaken the thesis for the easier to manage and less resource-intensive project.

Twenty-one years ago, in Fall 1992, SUNYIT had 86 full-time faculty and 54 part-time and adjunct faculty to support an enrollment of 1765 FTE. Two decades later, in Fall 2012 enrollment had grown marginally to 1804 FTE, an increase of just over 2%. However over the same time frame the size of the full-time faculty decreased to 76 (a decline of almost 12%); the use of part-time and adjunct faculty nearly doubled to 110, with much of the part-time growth attributable to the imposition of the 2000 General Education requirements and the need to greatly expand such offerings.

National reports (see “Are Professors Selling Students Short”, Inside Higher Education, March 21, 2013) suggest that by 2003 college faculty are teaching perhaps 25% fewer classes than they were in the late 1980s. This is not what I observe at SUNYIT. As suggested above, the size of the full-time faculty is down considerably. This decline has been achieved in several ways: (1) a significant number of retirements and departures as many in the cohort hired in the 1970s retired, died, or could no longer work; (2) non-renewals of junior faculty; and (3) negative tenure decisions. This is not to suggest that every vacated faculty position remained unfilled, but many did. Even as we begin to replenish our diminished ranks we do so with consequences.

The Inside Higher Education article asserts that the reduction in faculty course load is largely due to course releases for a variety of reasons such as part-time administrative assignments. At SUNYIT the chair of our Faculty Assembly has always had the option of either a one course per semester release or a full course load and one course per semester extra service compensation.

that the job comes with many expectations but little authority. Moreover, despite a one course release, the numerous meetings and events take a toll on their own scholarship. These costs and lost opportunity costs are difficult to quantify; the dollar savings are much more apparent.

Another dimension of the workload discussions nationally has centered around “fairness” and “equity”. Some colleges have developed policies encompassing a minimum enrollment which each faculty member is expected to achieve over a time frame like a semester or an academic year. Episodically this issue has raised its head at SUNYIT over the past four decades.

As a department chair, a dean, and as the Vice President for Academic Affairs for three years, I have always objected to this line of discussion. The history in my own department is a long one. In my early years here I was genuinely happy to teach lecture classes of sixty or seventy students that would enable our department to justify a special topics course with single digit enrollment. When senior administrators objected that one faculty member was allowed to teach two or three low-enrolled courses and this was somehow inefficient, I would point out that the department’s overall workload goals were, in fact, achieved. Our average class size was either at or above goal. What incentive would there be to offer any large classes if the large enrollment could not be used to offset low-enrolled classes?

I was often met with the retort that it would be preferable to eliminate both the large lecture and the small sections. This line of argument presumes that faculty are interchangeable when in fact they are not. Yes, every member of my department clearly has the intellectual wherewithal to teach a section of an introductory course, but not all can do it well. Is it a good use of resources to have a world-class mathematician teaching introductory calculus, or a literary genius teaching basic composition? Are we as a department better off assigning a faculty member to a graduate course with an enrollment of five where all students successfully complete the course, or to a freshman level course with an enrollment of forty and such a disconnect between the professor and the student that half the class fails? Clearly the answer can not be that all full-time faculty will teach only small graduate sections. But it is also the case that the best outcome is determined not by micromanagement or a formula favoring “fairness” or “equity”, but by the sound collective judgment of a department and its leadership to produce a quality outcome with an appropriate level of assigned resources.

As SUNYIT has evolved from a primarily teaching institution to one that is more research-centered, expectations of junior faculty have changed. Today, new faculty are counseled that their rate and quality of publications will be a prime consideration in renewal and tenure decisions. In applied areas new faculty are also told that external funding is expected. With so much time available, junior colleagues quickly learn that teaching and research “counts”, but service is secondary.

An important consequence of the altered priorities is that it is very difficult to cajole junior faculty to participate in governance and in the collective work of the faculty. The working committees of our Faculty Assembly (Academic Affairs, Curriculum, etc.) are staffed with seats assigned to each of our academic departments. Yet, for several of these committees one or more departments have declined to send faculty representatives. The collective body of work that the faculty engages in has not declined in two decades. The impact of technology on teaching and learning becomes more important with each passing year. Assessment and program review command more attention and effort than ever. Changes in SUNY policies respecting transfer and articulation and general education require time and effort on the part of Academic Affairs and Curriculum committees, but the number of faculty available to serve on these bod-
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...ies has declined. Senior faculty have departed, and junior faculty are counseled to concentrate on publications and bringing in funds rather than on institutional service. This past year we have found it necessary to amend our definition of a quorum for our standing committees to be a majority of those appointed reflecting the determination of some departments not to fill committee seats assigned to them. Governance is thus deprived of the breadth of opinion that should be present at the table when policy development takes place, and the entire institution suffers.

Carried to its logical conclusion, the outlook for faculty governance is not good. If faculty are actively discouraged from participating in the affairs of their campus during their formative years what will make them suddenly jump in after receipt of continuing appointment? The challenge is shaping up to be formidable, and increasing teaching loads will only exacerbate this problem.

---

**Kenneth P O'Brien**  
Associate Professor  
College at Brockport

**Much Ado About Something, in This Case Teaching Loads**

Last spring, Andrew Gillen, the Research Director at Education Sector published, "Selling Students Short: Declining Teaching

Loads at Colleges and Universities," an event that unleashed something of a critical firestorm. According to the conservative-leaning scholar, faculty teaching loads had declined about 25% between his baseline year of 1987-88 and the second decade of the current century. But, his data set’s flaws proved to be so serious that Education Sector “withdrew” the report.

This was but the latest in a fairly loud and decades-long campaign, largely funded by conservative think tanks, that identified faculty teaching productivity (honestly, it’s hard to write the phrase without a shudder) as one, if not the root, cause of the problem. For that reason, any who seek to find in the following a suggested “modal” number of courses per semester or year will be sorely disappointed.

With that caveat on the table, a number of points deserve consideration.

First, there is the “mission” of the public comprehensive college. Although it has been well-argued that each level of the American system attempts to move “up” the academic food chain, until it reaches the Olympian heights of an AAU research center, it’s not going to happen. Nor should it. The public comprehensive college, especially those in SUNY, have evolved from their 19th century roots in teacher education, an education that was at once philosophical and intensely practical. Educating teachers meant educating broadly, at the same time that it meant educating for a specific professional purpose.

And, as the SUNY Teachers College morphed into more comprehensive institutions by adding academic programs in the arts and sciences and then added new professional areas of competence, ranging from nursing to business, they maintained that combination of liberal arts integrated into and providing the core for many pre-professional programs.

And, the faculty that was hired during the transition mirrored those very institutional goals: being a teacher/scholar.

The professional expectations, regardless of discipline, focused on both teaching effectiveness and scholarly (or professional) engagement at a sustained level. How that was managed in terms of specific assignments in any given semester, on any given campus, varied, sometimes by discipline, sometimes by other means. For the College at Brockport, the norm became something akin to three courses a semester, a level that assumed an active research or professional engagement. At other colleges, it was higher.

Second, and this is the real point: suggesting any specific number would be both foolishly and senselessly, because the actual number of courses that we teach, as well as the number of students we teach in those courses, varies both across— and within—the comprehensive college campuses. Partly, this is a reflection of different disciplines, which can legitimately employ different class sizes depending upon the educational expectations of the class. History courses, as opposed to some other disciplines, demand close attention to critical reading and clear writing, which if taken seriously mandates smaller class sizes than other disciplines. In this, the discipline shares its desired educational outcomes with other programs in the Humanities and the Social Sciences. But, other disciplines have their own limiting factors.

Third, class size and the number of credits hours generated do not constitute the final tally for “faculty productivity.” Usually, comprehensive colleges adopt a rough 40% teaching, 40% scholarship, 20% service, but all that is negotiable, depending on the specific projects. What we have learned is that no one (or almost no one) divides their time in this fashion every semester. Rather we vary, according the current projects and number of preparation, size of classes, etc. You all know the drill.

What is the bottom line, then?

Comprehensive colleges seek, and need, to have faculty who divide their professional commitments among the three
normal areas of accountability: service (broadly defined), teaching and scholarship, with the last two almost equally balanced. In doing so, they hold each professor accountability for each of the three areas, but in different ways. Although none is easy to evaluate, teaching is the most difficult. Why? It is the most private, that is, the “public” sphere is the instructor in his or her class, limited usually to the students who are registered for that course. In each of the other areas, the actions are public, whether serving the campus or community or producing pieces that are subject to peer review. But, perhaps a more important impediment is that while we all agree on the goal of teaching – student learning – we also know that the single most important person in the acquisition of knowledge is NOT the teacher. It’s the student.

Why have I dwelled on the “accountability” issues of professorial activity? It’s because I believe that much of the argument for higher teacher loads is driven by an anti-faculty animus, and numbers of courses and numbers of students and numbers of credit hours generated is the easiest way to express that feeling by asking that professors at every level DO MORE. And since the number of students one teaches seems to have a more direct impact on college costs, it makes sense that teaching would be the area that gets attention.

Anthony Grafton and James Grossman concluded their 2011 critique of Richard Vedder’s report on faculty productivity at the University of Texas by noting that “Many practices should stand: the quality of research is measured by the result, not by the amount of money spent to achieve it; what students learn is more important than the efficiency of the delivery of information, and one size will never, never fit all.”

While I have my own questions about the first two principles (money counts in both research and teaching), I harbor none about the last. And this is my final point. Public comprehensive colleges are the “tweener” of higher education (between research universities and community colleges) with a generally understood teaching load of 3 or 4 courses per semester, not 2 per, not 5. They are also the “tweener” in their expectations between teaching and scholarship and service. A final note, I suspect the moment for the inflammatory pieces about faculty teaching may have passed, at least in New York. What I have seen in the past two years has been an equally dangerous trend, the elevation of research activity in the hope that it will lead directly to economic recovery. While a few valleys and triangles seem to offer promise, I believe the strongest contribution we make to the economic health of our communities, our state, and our nation is the nurturing, development and creation of human capital. This is the indirect value-added element we offer the state.

**Faulty Data on Faculty Teaching Loads**

Donald A. Grinde, Jr.
Professor
University at Buffalo

When I was asked by the editor of this Bulletin to comment on the issue raised in the article, “Lighter teaching loads for faculty contribute to rising college costs, report says,” The Chronicle of Higher Education, March 21, 2013, I was very perplexed because there was very little statistical basis in the article that would lend itself to an intellectual critique. My first reaction was that it is reductionist in its analysis of statistical information and that the conclusions about faculty workloads over time were highly speculative. Obviously, one could talk about the use of adjuncts etc. and a critique could also state that blending teaching loads at primarily undergraduate institutions with research universities is problematic because it’s like comparing apples and oranges. Several weeks after the request for my comments from Norm Goodman, I was glad to see that the paper was retracted in an article on April 18, 2013 in Inside Higher Education because the data were flawed and the conclusions and recommendations were, consequently, flawed. The retraction reinforced my suspicions that such a statistical study which supported a mega generalization over time about faculty workloads and costs is not only simplistic and problematic but also deeply and profoundly flawed.

I was trained as an economic historian and when I took social statistics as a graduate student, my instructor cracked a joke about statistical studies the first day of class. He stated that “figures don’t lie but liars can figure.” That quote came back to me when I first read the article. As an economic historian, I was trained to use statistics over time to explain the growth and development of the American economy. I had a professor who was a pioneer in using statistical analysis to study the growth and development of the American economy before the Civil War. In our first day of class, she explained that she went into economic history because she was dismayed at the inability of economics to reliably predict the future a couple of years out. Thus, she studied census data and did regression analysis of data to fill in some of the blanks about American economic growth. However, she often came to our graduate seminars perturbed about her statistical studies. One day, she announced that she had been working on a detailed regression analysis of the economy before the Civil War and it worked pretty good except that the analysis always seemed to indicate that the 1830s were a time of prosperity (qualitative evidence clearly indicates that the 1830s were like the 1930s, a time of considerable economic retraction) and, of course, that was wrong. She made a point of telling us that statistical analysis in economic history must be tempered with good qualitative analysis not only to avoid errors but also to provide balance and critical thinking in our work.

One of the things that I noticed in this article in the Chronicle was a tendency to avoid qualitative analysis and to assume that the data produced were almost self-evident with few qualifications. I learned in dealing with economic statistics over time that one had to say “all other things being equal” and to be somewhat tentative so you wouldn’t go too far out on a limb in your analysis and conclusions. I also saw that the report was produced by a think tank and having worked in Washington I know that such organizations frequently have an axe to grind and publish what their supporters want to hear.

I guess one of my most basic criticisms is that the article in the Chronicle was poorly constructed and did not let those of us that know the problems with statistics know anything about the assumptions and basis for the study. Thus, I’m glad that after a number of faculty groups questioned the validity of the underlying data, the Inside Higher Education article reported that the original report was withdrawn. It reported that the authors of the report noted the criticism that because the study did not take into account the use of adjunct and part-time faculty they “cannot determine whether teaching loads for the typical professor declined, stayed the same or increased.” This is a dramatic reversal for a report that stated “the average number of classes taught by tenure and tenure track faculty member decreased by 25% ... from 1987-1988 to 2003-2004.” Such a simplistic statistic was followed by “advocacy” when the authors stated: Colleges can and must take steps to stem the ever increasing rate of tuition increases. Increasing teaching loads, even marginally, can have a tremendous impact on cost.

This statement ignores the pressure to get grants and do research that are required of faculty at research universities.
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Four year colleges are under much less pressure to do that, and that is one of the reasons the teaching load is higher there. It also ignores the use of graduate students and their role in teaching at research universities.

In short, the article conflated the differences between institutions of higher learning and used a reductionist analysis in its overgeneralizations about faculty workloads over time. It ignored the growth of internships, independent study, online learning and several more innovations that have changed the way we teach and educate student over the last 25 years – there is not an attempt to measure or address those changes in instruction. Thus, it assumes that instruction and teaching has not changed in the last 25 years.

Well, I have wondered about in my analysis of the original article and its retraction. I think we can all agree that the retraction was an important result in that faulty data and assumptions lead to faulty conclusions and recommendations. There is certainly a need for a more complex study of workloads and productivity that incorporates more variables and available data as I have described above. Such analysis and study should also balance quantitative and qualitative evidence because higher education is not just about crunching number about class size, workloads etc. – it is also about innovation, research and informed critical thinking.

Balancing Faculty Responsibilities at Academic Medical Centers

Kerry A. Greene-Donnelly
Assistant Professor
Upstate Medical University

In an article “Selling Students Short” written by Allen Gillen in the March 2013 edition of the March 2013 edition of

Inside Higher Education and later retracted (April 17, 2013), the author presented data supporting the theory that decreasing teaching loads are driving the increased cost of education at US colleges and universities. The supporting data presented in the article was found to be inconsistent, resulting from serious methodological errors. In spite of the retraction and the awareness that the data cannot be used to compare teaching loads across time frames and cannot support Gillen’s theory, the discussion of teaching loads on tuition costs continues, as well it should. This article discusses teaching loads in health sciences education and what effect increasing the loads would have.

It is well known that faculty members possess a broad range of responsibilities that include teaching, research and service; however, for faculty in academic medical centers, an additional responsibility is critical: that of engaging in clinical practice. Health sciences faculty must maintain current clinical skills and knowledge to maintain individual licensure and board specialization; teach with relevance, especially in the changing financial climates of today’s health care practice; utilize the most current equipment and tests and measures, and build relationships with clinical staff and facilities to provide patients for teaching laboratory experiences and clinical sites for student clinical placements. Academic health science centers must maintain a wide range of accreditations for the college as a whole and for individual curricula. Curricula accrediting bodies have many requirements for the faculty including scholarship, clinical practice and didactic limitations such as student to teacher ratios. Health sciences faculty members require a balance of teaching time and clinical time to deliver optimal education to their students and optimal patient care to their patients, all while meeting accreditation standards. Maintaining appropriate time for clinical practice, the fourth area of faculty responsibility is imperative to health sciences educational quality and retention of health science faculty members and medical services to the local community.

In addition to the health science faculty’s need for clinical practice is a less talked about issue: the need to provide revenue for the college. It is no secret the academic health science centers have become leaner due to declining state support and reimbursement cuts at a federal and state level. In fact, many academic health science centers have sustained substantial cuts in support over the past 5 years. Generating revenue is an answer to these unsustainable cuts, which requires clinical faculty to generate revenue at increasing rates. Generating revenue is also used to offset faculty salaries, particularly in the health sciences sector. Generating revenue requires clinic time, which impacts time available for teaching.

Generating revenue through clinical practice by health sciences faculty has several benefits to the academic health sciences sector. Health science faculty members who provide clinical services to the Health Science Center are providing needed services for the patients without additional costs to the facility. The clinical services delivered meet the needs of the faculty and create revenue for the clinical and academic sides of the institution. Clinical practice also allows faculty to share knowledge with health science practitioners, improving the quality of care through currency.

Academic medical centers must maintain the facilities, i.e. hospitals or clinics to support clinical practice for the maintenance of skills. Faculty not only use the facilities as the classroom when teaching students, but also as a means of sustaining and expanding their knowledge and experience. Increasing teaching loads would not only limit the time for clinical practice but limit the quality of education to the students by limiting the experience and knowledge base of the faculty member.

Research is a major responsibility of health science faculty, which affects promotion and tenure, as well as creating a revenue stream to the academic medical center through indirect costs. Academic health science centers are evaluated on the quantity and quality of the research produced by faculty of the center. Measures include the dollar amount in supported research grants and the quality of research measured by the types of publication and prestige of the publication. The level of funding or how much revenue the academic medical center receives to support research activities is a well-established measure of comparison; however, research and grant writing is a time-intensive endeavor, and even more so if the research is clinically based. Financial challenges of academic medical centers drive an increased pressure to generate grant funding. This pressure may mean more but necessary time spent in writing unsuccessful grants to secure those few successful grants. Financial constraints facing academic health science centers create this pressure, which has the unintended consequence of challenging teaching time, a non-revenue generating endeavor. Balancing teaching loads with clinical practice and research responsibilities supports the academic environment in academic medical centers and provides needed revenue to maintain faculty. Research, the future of health care discoveries, would be negatively impacted if teaching loads for health science faculty were increased.

Attracting and retaining qualified faculty is a challenging and difficult task. The combined responsibilities of clinical practice, teaching, research and service are not easily done in a traditional work day. Experienced faculty members are challenged to meet all areas of responsibility. Developing new faculty members is a unique challenge to health centers. Faculty must possess a strong clinical background as a foundation to support scholarship and teaching activities. Transitioning from a full time clinical practice to an academic position requires additional education, either in the form of professional development or formal advanced degree completion. Providing adequate time for the new academic faculty member to acclimate them to their new respon-
sibilities is necessary to insure their successful transition. Maintaining appropriate teaching loads ensures time for scholarship and research, both requirements for the tenure and promotion process as well as for meeting accreditation requirements for many health center curricula. Increased teaching responsibilities would negatively impact faculty as a whole and, most especially, to those working toward a tenure academic position.

Academic medical centers serve a wide range of students from associate/bachelors/masters/doctorate level allied health and nursing students to traditional medical students and residents. Attracting the most desirable students is the goal of all institutions and academic medical centers are no different. Students are savvy consumers in today's educational environment and they seek out the best organizations. Recruiting and retaining the highest-level student is as difficult as recruiting and retaining faculty members. Balancing the teaching loads for quality education and research responsibilities for advanced study are important educational measures for prospective students. Increasing teaching load to the detriment of research opportunities will not only hurt recruitment of staff but students as well. Student education does not occur in a vacuum; knowledge gained from the clinical setting, classroom and research activities all have positive implications for the student. Limiting the faculty members’ opportunities, therefore, limits the student opportunities.

Community service is an important part of any campuses mission and has a profound positive impact on the faculty and students. Giving back to one’s community enriches the educational and personal growth of those on our campus, thus enriching both the community we serve and the campus community. Providing community service through an academic medical center may have all of the similar properties of those projects on general academic campuses; however, there are special areas that the academic medical center can improve in our communities through service. Increased teaching loads would limit this mission on an academic medical center campus most especially.

Academic medical centers have the unique blend of knowledge, skills and resources to provide both general community services such as neighborhood maintenance projects or assisting with Habitat for Humanity. Academic centers provide directed community education on a wide variety of topics; health centers provide community education and intervention that directly and positively impacts our communities. Community education on specific health issues such as diabetes education, nutrition or physical activity may take place with community centers, schools or religious groups. The most specialized community service is the service academic medical centers provide to those at high risk for disease and the underserved in our community. Such initiatives include providing mobile care to the migrant farm worker populations, screening for vascular disease, and volunteering community health centers. Providing skilled medical personnel at no cost or a low cost to the neediest individuals in our community positively impacts their lives in a most basic way. Providing a safety net or resources to the most vulnerable in our community truly serves the community as a whole. Increasing teaching loads, and therefore work load expectations, at an academic medical center would certainly limit the ability of this highly trained workforce to offer assistance to those in the most need. In addition, community service initiatives are an excellent means for student education and limiting these opportunity in a student’s education is to limit that education.

Academic medical centers strive to maintain a delicate balance of academics, patient care, research, and community service. Each mission is of equal importance as all are woven together in such a way as to support the academic medical center’s mission. The balance of each of the four pillars must be maintained to provide quality care to the patient population, quality educational experiences to the student and a challenging and rewarding work experience for the faculty. Increasing teaching loads would disrupt the balance in such a way as to decrease the quality of all missions of the Academic medical center.

Celebrating New York State and New Yorkers
American Medical Pioneer: Emily Dunning Barringer, M.D., 1876-1961
Daniel S. Marrone
Distinguished Service Professor
Farmingdale State College

Who was the first female licensed doctor in the United States? This is a debatable question to precisely answer because there were countless women performing midwife and other extensive medical duties well before and after the turn of the 20th century. However, it was Emily Dunning who broke the chauvinistic, legal, and professional barriers to become the first female ambulance surgeon and fulfill New York State’s medical licensure requirements. Facing daunting bureaucratic stone walls, gender discrimination, and legal barriers, Dr. Dunning became the first fully licensed female physician in New York State in 1904—but only after overcoming much difficulty.

Although graduating second in her class at Cornell University’s Medical School in 1901, due to her gender, Dr. Dunning was denied the opportunity to enter any medical internship/residency program within New York. Unfortunately, up to 1902, women were not permitted to be licensed physicians in New York. Thankfully that year, former Columbia University president, Seth Low won the NYC Mayorality on the “Reform/Fusion/Republican Party” ticket. Once in office, Mayor Low rescinded the policy denying females entry into hospital residencies. Overcoming the misguided belief that the task of an ambulance surgeon was too strenuous and risky for a female, she uncompromisingly excelled in this role. Completing all licensure requirements, she was the first female recipient to be awarded the “New York License to Practice Medicine.” The year was 1904. Shortly thereafter, she married Dr. Benjamin Stockwell Barringer—hence her full name. She wrote about her early career in a book that was later transformed into a 1950 Hollywood film, “The Girl in White,” starring June Allyson.

Her fame was further enhanced through ingenuity and valor during World War I. Dr. Emily Barringer brought to the European Theater of battle, techniques to rapidly treat and transport wounded soldiers from the frontlines through the use of motorized ambulances—an expertise she mastered while in her NYC Bellevue Hospital medical residency. By promptly driving the wounded “doughboys” to medical care facilities, she saved hundreds of lives! Following the war, Dr. Barringer made other breakthroughs in the care and treatment of the sick. In particular, her research focused on the treatment of venereal diseases. Due to social stigma, venereal disease medical care was rarely studied and, as a result, medical practices in this area were grossly outdated and ineffective. She researched and experimented with alternative venereal disease treatment therapies. Her efforts led to many improvements in the alleviation of death and suffering connected with this affliction. Dr. Barringer became the nation’s, if not the world’s, leading expert in gynecological medicine and treatment relating to venereal disease.

Following the outbreak of World War II, Dr. Barringer strove to recognize the contribution of women in battlefield medicine. She successfully lobbied the U.S. Congress with the Sparkman Act (1943) that authorized the awarding of military officer commissions for women in the U.S. Army Medical Corps. As a result, female doc-
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tors and licensed nurses were then granted officer ranks in the U.S. Army as well as in the U.S. Navy and U.S. Public Health Service. [My father, who served in the U.S. Navy for 32 years, was forever proud to see his niece, a nurse, in her "U.S.N. Officer Dress Blues."]

In Dr. Barringer’s later career, she moved to and practiced medicine in Connecticut. During her long, fruitful life, she attained a worldwide reputation in the advancement of so many vital medical and government policy practices. She passed away in 1961. In 2000, Dr. Barringer was inducted into the prestigious Connecticut Women’s Hall of Fame. She was a superlative role model for women entering the medical fields as well as being a true American hero!

Reference:

ABOVE: Dr. Emily Dunning, Ambulance Surgeon in New York City, 1902-1903.

Below: Dr. Emily Dunning Barringer in her later career.

Presentations
There were four presentations at this Plenary Meeting, each of which is available on the University Faculty website (http://www.suny.edu/faculty senate) under Plenary Meetings/SUNY Maritime Plenary Fall 2013:

• Budget statement by Robert Haelen, Interim Vice Chancellor for Financial Services
• Open SUNY by Carey Hatch, Associate Provost for Academic Technology and Information Services
• Shared Services by Brian Hutzley, Vice Chancellor for Shared Services
• Our Commitment on Student Completion Services by Elizabeth Bringsjord, Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor

Committee action plans for 2013-2014

[Editors’ note: The charge and membership of each of the Standing Committees of the University Faculty Senate can be found on the Senate’s website (http://www.suny.edu/faculty senate.edu).]

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

• “Making diversity count” position paper: These recommendations on the institutional structures of diversity and faculty and staff reward structure has been vetted by the University Faculty Senate (UFS) and will now be sent to the 64 SUNY campuses.
• Plenary presentation of the position paper’s recommendation: The “functional possibilities” in the implementation of the recommendations of the position paper, along with the substantive feedback from the campuses, will subject of a presentation of an upcoming Plenary Meeting of the UFS. The broad goal of this presentation is to provide talking points, responses and strategies to the Campus Governance Leaders and other campus leaders who are responsible for issues of diversity and inclusion on the campuses.
• Planning a themed conference on “making diversity count”: This conference will be co-sponsored by the UFS and the SUNY Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI) and held in October 2014.
• Diversity and Inclusion of Native American, Veterans, and LGBTQAI populations: The committee will be looking at the problems of inclusion of these populations and what might be equitable solutions to these problems.
• Health care disparities: The committee is pursuing a “Conversations in the Discipline” grant to fund a conference, workshop or seminar to address health care disparities within SUNY.
• System-wide diversity survey: The committee is working on a survey to compile useful information that will allow, the UFS, the committee, and the ODEI to get a view of the diversity landscape and structures on SUNY campuses (e.g., the existence and location of a diversity office/professional committee/council, a diversity requirement in the General Education curriculum, and any other useful information.

Ethics and Institutional Integrity Committee
Charles Moran, Chair SUNY Cobleskill

• Committee Charge: The committee is increasing focused on the visibility and awareness of ethics education, research and policy across SUNY. The committee is not an adjudicative body and not in a position to render opinions or judgments.
• Forum: The committee has developed three alternative forms of presentation for an initial Forum on the Practice of Ethics (“Looking for the GOOD”) to be facilitated by Andy Fitz-Gibbon (Cortland). The committee plans to present one or more versions, starting with a presentation of this Forum at a regular plenary meeting of the University Faculty Senate (UFS).
• Policy strategy: The committee continues work on a draft policy statement on Ethical and Professional Conduct, which is intended to be a collaboration of the UFS with SUNY Administration. The committee’s first area of policy is electronic privacy that would serve as a prototype for further policy. The recent publicity of confusion over such a statement’s implementation at Harvard University has brought attention to the role and sensitivity of such policies. The committee has reviewed ethics policies of the
Board of Trustees and the Research Foundation, which differ substantially in purpose and may not serve adequately as guidelines. The next steps are to draft a policy in collaboration with SUNY Administration that, if successful, will be presented to the Executive Committee of the UFS.

- Academic ethics database: The committee continues to pursue a database of academic ethics activities across SUNY. In order to make progress on this effort, the committee may pursue secondary sources with the strategy of publishing electronically a data base and then updating it periodically.

- Committee guiding statement: The committee has reviewed elements of a draft statement intended to be a guiding light for the committee’s role within the UFS. This drafting effort has been enriched by the other committee activities and continues to be a high priority as it will help to define and enable the committee.

Governance Committee
Rochelle Mozlin, Chair
College of Optometry

At the Fall Planning Meeting, the Governance Committee prepared an ambitious agenda for the coming year. Here are the main projects the Governance Committee will be tackling:

- Orientation for new Campus Governance Leaders (CGLs): An orientation for CGLs of both state-operated campuses and community colleges was conducted in June 2013. This was the inaugural event of SUNY Voices, a system-wide initiative to enhance and give greater visibility to shared governance across the system. This orientation will be occurring in 2014, and will be expanded to include orientation for the Student Assembly representatives.

- SUNY Voices: SUNY Voices will also be sponsoring a conference on Shared Governance in the 21st Century, April 23-24th in Albany. Mark your calendars, more information will be coming soon.

- Academic freedom: What is it, what is it NOT and where does it intersect with faculty life? The committee will be developing a document that addresses these questions. This may become especially relevant as Open SUNY is implemented.

- Presidential review on shared governance: How can we measure whether a campus president is a champion of shared governance? The Chancellor has asked the UFS to provide advice on this issue and this committee has undertaken this task.

- Start Up NY: This program is Governor Cuomo’s initiative to transform SUNY campuses and other university communities across the state into tax-free communities for new and expanding businesses. These projects are being developed very quickly on many campuses! The Governance Committee is working closely with campus governance leaders to make sure faculty governance is involved in evaluating the ways in which these projects fit the academic mission of the campus, as required by the legislation.

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

- Graduate Research Symposium: The committee will work with the Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policies Committee as it prepares for its Undergraduate Research Symposium to allow for the transfer of “best practices” for the Graduate Research Symposium in 2015.

- Attracting the best graduate students to SUNY: A subcommittee has interviewed a sample of 20 graduate students across SUNY as the initial step in developing a broad-based survey of SUNY graduate students to help campuses better position themselves to attract the best graduate students.

- Sustainability in education: A subcommittee will be developing a framework for sustainability concepts to be potentially integrated in the campus curriculum at all levels and for all fields. Working with the SUNY Office of Sustainability, the subcommittee will organize a workshop for SUNY faculty on “sustainability in education” in spring 2014.

- Graduate student salary (dis)parity across SUNY campuses: The committee has a fairly complete data set on graduate salaries across SUNY campuses. It will be working with the Provost’s Office and the Research Foundation and will analyze these data to provide a report to the University Faculty Senate.

- Increase the number of graduate students obtaining various available fellowships: A subcommittee will be exploring ways to encourage SUNY graduate students to seek and obtain fellowships that are available from federal agencies and private foundations.

- STEM Undergraduate Research Working Group: Representatives of the committee will participate in this Research Foundation workshop.

Program and Awards Committee
Dennis Showers, Chair
SUNY Geneseo

The committee seeks to maintain and improve the Conversations in the Disciplines (CID) program.

- Raise the profile of the program and integrate the awards with the Strategic Plan

- Promote the awards more vigorously and increase the number of proposals

- Support the Chancellor’s goal of “celebrating” the awards for SUNY and for the individual campuses.

The committee will work to help with the rollout of the two new Chancellor’s awards and to look for ways to improve the program.

- Considering a response to concerns of insufficient faculty involvement in the assembly and operation of the campus nominations committees

- Consider the feasibility of a new award for faculty work in cooperative learning, experiential learning, and internships, or whether these activities can be incorporated into existing awards by revising the criteria.

- Examine the role of on-line instruction and how it fits into the teaching and service awards

- Strengthen and systematize publicity before and after awards are made.

- Gather information about how these systems operate on different SUNY campuses to assure that each program is meeting its intended goals.

The committee is also considering a data-gathering process whereby the future work of the committee can be guided by accurate information from the campuses as they seek to implement these programs.

Student Life Committee
Kelley J. 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 Student Affairs Offices to gather, assimilate and prepare meaningful information and policies on a variety of topics such as the following:

“White Paper” on Best Practices for Textbook Affordability

- The committee plans to study and report on some of the best ways to help students afford textbooks such as eversions, how and where to purchase texts and options for pricey on-line homework programs.

- The committee will urge all faculty members to consider putting textbooks on reserve in their libraries, as it is not most libraries’ policy to pur-
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chase textbooks.

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 the Spring of 2014.

Hazing and Bullying

• A “white paper” has been started on the differences between the two and will focus on best practices on SUNY campuses.

• This will be a collaborative effort with the chief Student Affairs Officers from each SUNY campus, particularly the four-year campuses.

Inclusiveness Initiative for Gender and Sexual Identity

• Information is being gathered about the different aspects of gender and sexual identity as they are manifested in areas such as housing, graduation, events and acceptance.

Transfer Students

• Seamless transfer may mean that more students do transfer and therefore we are planning to look at and collect best practices from around SUNY to provide examples for those campuses looking for help with transfer student acclimation.

Other Topics

• Discussions have started about student support services for International Students, non-traditional students who need services outside regular business hours, and support for Open SUNY students.

• Concerns about the underground nature of drugs and alcohol on campuses have led several of the committee members to begin another preliminary discussion of what can be done about these concerns.

• A “white paper” has been started on the differences between the two and will focus on best practices on SUNY campuses.

• This will be a collaborative effort with the chief Student Affairs Officers from each SUNY campus, particularly the four-year campuses.

Inclusiveness Initiative for Gender and Sexual Identity

• Information is being gathered about the different aspects of gender and sexual identity as they are manifested in areas such as housing, graduation, events and acceptance.

Transfer Students

• Seamless transfer may mean that more students do transfer and therefore we are planning to look at and collect best practices from around SUNY to provide examples for those campuses looking for help with transfer student acclimation.

Other Topics

• Discussions have started about student support services for International Students, non-traditional students who need services outside regular business hours, and support for Open SUNY students.

• Concerns about the underground nature of drugs and alcohol on campuses have led several of the committee members to begin another preliminary discussion of what can be done about these concerns.
determine effective indicators of teacher candidate success;
And be it further resolved that the Task Force be charged to complete its work by June 30, 2014;
And be it further resolved that the changes to admissions criteria be held in abeyance until the Task Force on Predictive Indicators of Teacher Candidate Quality has completed its work.
Passed unanimously

Resolution on Failure of Consultation and Shared Governance Regarding SUNY Educator Preparation Programs and the New NY Education Reform Commission

Whereas the SUNY Board of Trustees passed “Resolution on SUNY Educator Preparation Programs and the New NY Education Reform Commission” on September 18, 2013 that establishes specific admissions criteria for teacher education programs without appropriate consultation with either the University Faculty Senate or the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, and
Whereas a core principle of shared governance is faculty responsibility for designing and teaching the curriculum, including setting admission standards for programs, and
Whereas there is a long history of effective partnership among faculty governance, the SUNY administration and the SUNY Board of Trustees on academic issues, and
Whereas Chancellor Zimpher has recognized the central role of faculty in matters of academics as well as having repeatedly voiced strong support for shared governance in the past,
Therefore, Be It Resolved The University Faculty Senate decries the passage of said resolution without consultation with faculty governance and requests that in light of this incident the Chancellor and the SUNY Board of Trustees uphold the long-standing principles of shared governance as published in the Policies of the Board of Trustees to produce a comprehensive strategy to continue to ensure the quality of students admitted to teacher education programs.
Passed unanimously

Mark your calendars!

Innovative Exploration Forum
Undergraduate Research in New York State's Public Higher Education System

Legislative Office Building
Albany, NY

April 1, 2014
## University Faculty Senate

### Senators 2013-2014

**System Administration**
- Jim Campbell
- Fred Hildebrand

**University at Albany**
- Danielle Leonard
- J. Philippe Abraham
- John Schmidt

**Binghamton University**
- Robert Mess
- Randall McGuire
- Thomas Sinclair

**University at Buffalo**
- Donald Grinde
- Kathleen Kieler
- Peter Nickerson
- Adly Fam

**Stony Brook University**
- Arty Shertzer
- Georges Fouron
- D. Kane Gillespie
- Edward Feldman

**SUNY Brockport**
- P. Gibson Ralph
- Logan Rath

**SUNY Cortland**
- Joseph Marren
- Scott Goodman

**Empire State College**
- Edward Warzala

**SUNY Fredonia**
- Renata Barneva

**SUNY Geneseo**
- Dennis Showers

**SUNY Old Westbury**
- Minna Barrett

**SUNY Oneonta**
- Renee Walker

**SUNY Oswego**
- Gwen Kay

**SUNY Plattsburgh**
- Karen Volkman

**SUNY Potsdam**
- Walter Conley

**Purchase College**
- Keith Landa

**Downstate Medical Center**
- Stephen Rinnert
- Virginia Anderson
- Henry Flax
- Kathleen Powderly

**SUNY College of Optometry**
- Rebecca Marinoff

**Upstate Medical University**
- JC Trussel
- Jay Brenner
- Kerry Greene
- Susan Wojcik

**Alfred State College**
- Calista McBride

**SUNY Canton**
- Charles Fenner

**SUNY Cobleskill**
- Barbara Brabetz

**SUNY Delhi**
- Nana-Yaw Andoh

**Farmingdale State College**
- Louis Scala

**Morrisville State College**
- Timothy Gerken

**College of Environmental Science and Forestry**
- Klaus Doelle

**SUNY Maritime College**
- Maryellen Keefe

**SUNY IT**
- Ron Sarner

**New York State College of Ceramics at Alfred**
- Joseph Scheer

**New York State College of Agriculture and Life Sciences at Cornell University**
- Anthony Hay

**New York State College of Human Ecology at Cornell University**
- Sharon Sassler

**New York State College of Industrial & Labor Relations at Cornell University**
- John Bishop

**New York State College of Veterinary Medicine at Cornell University**
- Linda Mizer

---

### Campus Governance Leaders 2013-2014

**Campus Governance Leader Convener**
- Jan Trybula, SUNY Potsdam

**University at Albany**
- Christine Wagner

**Binghamton University**
- Howard Brown
- Alistair Lees
- Randall Edouard

**University at Buffalo**
- Ezra Zübrow
- Ann Marie Landel

**Stony Brook University**
- Frederick Walter

**SUNY Brockport**
- Dawn Jones

**Buffalo State College**
- David Carson

**SUNY Cortland**
- Jeff Walkuski

**Empire State College**
- Tom McElroy

**SUNY Fredonia**
- Robert Deemer

**SUNY Geneseo**
- James McLean

**SUNY Old Westbury**
- Duncan Quarless

**SUNY Oneonta**
- Paul Zuckerman

**SUNY Oswego**
- Joan Carroll

**SUNY Plattsburgh**
- Sandra Rezac

**SUNY Potsdam**
- Jan Trybula

**Purchase College**
- Peggy DeCooke

**Alfred State College**
- James Grillo

**SUNY Canton**
- Elizabeth Erickson

**SUNY Cobleskill**
- Bruce Wright

**SUNY Delhi**
- Jared Yando

**Farmingdale State College**
- Louis Scala

**Morrisville State College**
- Timothy Gerken

---

**College of Environmental Science and Forestry**
- Klaus Doelle

**SUNY Maritime College**
- Maryellen Keefe

**SUNY IT**
- Ron Sarner

**New York State College of Ceramics at Alfred**
- Joseph Scheer

**New York State College of Agriculture and Life Sciences at Cornell University**
- Anthony Hay

**New York State College of Human Ecology at Cornell University**
- Sharon Sassler

**New York State College of Industrial & Labor Relations at Cornell University**
- John Bishop

**New York State College of Veterinary Medicine at Cornell University**
- Linda Mizer

---

**Carl P. Wiezalis University Faculty Senate Fellows**

**Stony Brook University**
- Norman Goodman

**SUNY Potsdam**
- Joseph Hildreth