Interesting Times

There have been more a few times during the past six months when I was reminded of the ancient Chinese curse, “May you live in interesting times.” Much has happened, beginning with the transformation of the Chancellor’s tour of all 64 campuses (Phase 1, as she has called it) into an extensive strategic planning process (Phase 2) that included eight separate conversations in every part of the state and more than two hundred conversationalists, partly employees of the State University, partly representatives from business, politics, social service agencies and almost every other organized sector of life in New York. The next phase occurred this April with the statewide, eight-stop rollout of short form of the strategic plan, “The Power of SUNY,” to the university community and the broader public, which will then be followed by a much more detailed, comprehensive publication this summer.

In the past six months, the Board of Trustees, which added several new members in the past two months, has adopted three resolutions (Student Mobility in October, revision of General Education in January and Assessment in March) that while built upon past practice, revise what has become our standard practice in significant ways. Very brief summaries of the revisions follow:

- **Student Mobility.** A reaffirmation of SUNY’s forty-year commitment to seamless transfer, but with this resolution there is a commitment by the Provost’s Office to full implementation, across all campuses, across all majors to parallel the ease which with general education courses transfer from one campus to another. And when issues arise about the appropriate transfer of courses, requirements, or credits from one campus to another, there are appeals processes in place for both individual students and campuses that employ teaching faculty to adjudicate the appeal and make a recommendation to the Provost’s Office.

- **General Education.** A major revision that provides for the possibility of significant variation across the system by establishing a different minimum configuration of areas: campuses can now design programs that allow students to complete the 30 credit requirement by fulfilling seven of the ten enumerated categories, as long as two of those required are basic communication and mathematics.

- **Assessment.** The SUNY Assessment Initiative has been a decade-old, largely successful effort toward system-wide integration of assessment techniques and measures. But now that the regional and disciplinary accreditation agencies have identified over the past decade, but they extend them by placing the primary responsibility on each campus and on its shared governance structure.

At most other moments, these three issues would constitute the heart of the President’s report, but the first eight months of the Zimpher administration has coincided with one of the most threatening budget crises in New York State in the recent history, certainly since the mid-1970’s when the impending bankruptcy of New York City resulted in major funding shortfalls for all state agencies.

This fall, the Governor announced a cut of $90 million in the current SUNY budget, a cut about which there was no discussion or debate in Albany since, as a state agency, legislative action was not required. Part of a reduction of a half billion in state spending to meet increasing shortfalls in tax collections, the
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support, including funding for the core academic mission, construction, and personnel fringes.

In short, we are facing what we hope will be a short-term national economic crisis with both short-term and long-term implications for New York State, one consequence of which is the fact that SUNY’s level of base support has now slipped (in real dollar terms) to the level of the early 1990’s. Another way of looking at the budget over time is to note that in percentage terms the state support of the core SUNY budget is half today what it was twenty years ago, with the recent crisis accelerating this long-term trend of disinvestment in public higher education.

This is the background for the two major initiatives of the new administration, the strategic planning process and the Public Higher Education Empowerment and Innovation Act (which I will refer to as the “Empowerment Act”).

First, the strategic planning process: We have now made the transition from the eight conversations of the past six months to the release of “The Power of SUNY,” which was first unveiled to the public in New York City on April 12 and then at seven other locations throughout the state in the following two weeks. By the time of this publication, the release will have been completed and you will have had an opportunity to read the document for yourselves.

What I see—and it isn’t the only way to view the direction the plan provides—is that we are at the beginning of a major redefinition of the relationship between the citizens of the state and their public university. The SUNY promise is to become a much more critical player in the life of the larger community, bringing our knowledge, expertise, institutional reach and research capability to bear on pressing social problems, such as the state of health in New York, the need for clean, renewable energy, and our disastrously leaky educational pipeline. Redefining the Land Grant tradition for the 21st century and recalling the patterns of social discrimination that provided the seedbed out of which SUNY emerged, the strategic plan commits the university to “aligning our purpose with New York State’s needs and opportunities, and creating an economic engine capable of propelling a new era of growth.” The “Power of SUNY” can leverage our stature, knowledge, and research capability to address these seemingly intractable contemporary problems.

In a sense, the plan commits the public university to abandon its ivory tower for the mean streets where our constituents live, engaging our students and faculty, our natural and social scientists, our health educators and practitioners to help craft solutions to real-world problems. This commitment to the larger society of which we are a part and from which we draw a significant (albeit shrinking) share of our resources has a distinguished place in the history of American public higher education, particularly as articulated in what was termed the “Wisconsin Idea” at the turn of the last century, which transformed state’s public university into a service agency for the state government, assisting it in addressing the social inequities created by the rapid industrialization of the late 19th century.

This public mission of the public university was distinctive, giving to the state university a role that could be played by no other agency in the state. In our case, as we move into the second decade of the 21st century, the issues are quite different from those of a century ago, but the shape of the relationship, with mutual obligations of support and service, are not.

And that brings us to the Empowerment Act, which recognizes the fiscal realities that prevailed during the past three decades and seeks to provide a greater range of independent action by SUNY and its administration. Frankly, there is little that would be considered “revolutionary” in the act outside New York State, inasmuch as its three major initiatives mirror the practices enjoyed by almost every other public university or public system of higher education in the country. What are the initiatives? SUNY gaining control over its tuition, both by setting the appropriate level of tuition and by keeping the tuition collected; SUNY being released from the excessively burdensome state regulations governing large purchases that now require prior approval by the State; and SUNY being authorized to engage in public-private partnerships without prior approval of either the Attorney General or the Comptroller.

Yet, in each of these areas accountability is maintained through multiple levels of required approval internally and post-partnerships reports and audits externally. Each of these elements could be an important part of SUNY’s future, as it copes with that previously mentioned three-decade long pattern of declining levels of state support.

Without engaging in the debate over the Act that we have read and heard about during the past couple of months, I think there are three elements that merit special mention.

First, the Act has the potential of dividing the system, as campuses—and/or sectors—view the legislation through the lens of their own interests. This possibility has been evident in the shape of the debate to date, and through faculty organizations, as demonstrated by the United University Professions decision to oppose the Act while the University Faculty Senate’s Executive Committee endorsed its principles. This disagreement is an indication of the differing perspectives within an organization this complex and diverse. For example, some campuses will have opportunities denied others, and hence, the administrations and staffs were among the early supporters of the Act, while others waited for more fully articulated policies that dealt with the future implementation of aspects of the Act, especially Tuition policy and the Resource Allocation Policy.

Second, the Act seems untimely to some, since it offers a long-term solution to a long-term funding problem, while the State and SUNY confront an immediate short-term crisis. Few of the Act’s elements, for example, offer immediate relief from the impact of the cuts SUNY has suffered, or those it is projected to suffer yet. The one possible immediate aid, a tuition increase, is problematic, inasmuch as it would take an increase of about $1,600, which is a jump of more than 30%, to cover the projected cuts in the Governor’s Executive Budget. No one is considering anything approaching that figure. On the other hand, it is also true that any tuition increase kept by SUNY could at least ameliorate the need for some of the more drastic consequences that could be required to meet the projected cuts on the campuses. Current projections, for example, estimate a loss of 2,700
separate class this fall, which could have incalculable effects on students and their progress toward degrees. These first two elements, rather than being taken as arguments against the Act, serve as a reminder to not oversell its benefits or see it as a panacea for all our fiscal woes.

Which brings me to my third point: At the University Faculty Senate’s Winter Plenary Meeting in January, after the Senators had listened to two hours of explanation regarding the benefits of the Act, they concluded that they really did not have enough information to make a reasonable decision about the pending legislation. From the chair, I committed my office to providing the Senators with the best, most relevant information it developed, and I promised to keep them informed as event unfolded. If, as we might think might be the case, the Senate needed to act before our next plenary, we would use electronic communication media to make certain that the Executive Committee was, to the extent it could be determined, representing the broadest number of SUNY faculty and professional staff and could act on their behalf. I believe that processes we put into place (including phone and email communications, both with the Senators, Campus Governance Leaders) culminated in a resolution in support of the Act’s principles that represented the sentiments of the broadest number of our constituents. (The details of this process can be found in the section, “From the Editors’ Desk,” in this Bulletin.) In this sense, the promise we made in January was kept.

Despite these seemingly endless budgetary woes, the effective work of the Senate, like that of teaching faculty across the University, goes on. Some of it is truly remarkable. For example, in mid-April I was privileged to attend a poster exhibition of undergraduate research that was sponsored by the Senate’s Undergraduate Committee, with financial assistance from the Provost’s Office. It was held in the Legislative Office Building here in Albany, right in front of the elevators that legislators and their staffs used to get to their offices. (A brief description of this event and representative pictures of the display can be found elsewhere in this Bulletin.) This exhibition parallels the annual SUNY Student Art Show that is under the artistic direction of Distinguished Service Professor Joe Hildreth (SUNY Potsdam), a former President of the University Faculty Senate.

The current research poster exhibition was extraordinary, attracting 150 students who worked with 85 faculty mentors on 98 projects. The students came from 32 campuses, seven of which were community colleges. The range of topics was as diverse as the students themselves, and even though it is grossly unfair to single out one, I will mention a study in microbiology conducted by two young women at Onondaga Community College (OCC). C-Step students, they produced a study, and then a technique, that measured bacteria in the mouth more effectively, more efficiently and more quickly. This promised, according to their proud mentor, means to better dental care.

As I talked with them, I learned that one of the students had returned to OCC after earning her bachelor’s degree at Buffalo State College and was taking the core courses required for her pending medical school applications. Preparing for the MCAT exams, she was committed to providing a better life for herself and better health care for her community. In looking at this young woman, I saw a smiling, proud, wonderfully engaging face. This is the real “Power of SUNY,” our ability to inspire student learning, to provide pathways for young (and not-so-young) men and women planning for careers in medicine, law, business, academe, and elsewhere, life choices that as little as a generation ago would have been unimagined.

And so, we are indeed living in interesting times, a moment in the history of the SUNY system when the administration is attempting to craft new, stable, and predictable funding streams, while at the same time using a planning process that led to a strategic plan that re-commits SUNY to the long tradition of public engagement with the most pressing social and economic issues of the day. Despite the budgetary crisis, then, this is a unique moment of us to become re-engaged in our work, our research, our productions, our students, and our communities as proud members of the SUNY family.

Carl T. Hayden
Chair
SUNY Board of Trustees

What we criticize is a tradition of over-regulation that has its roots in the legal conception of SUNY as a state agency, a tradition that dates from 1948 but which, the Commission is convinced, SUNY has now outgrown. Over-regulation pervades every aspect of SUNY's operation, in ways large and small.

Independent Commission on the Future of the State University of New York (1985)

Today, SUNY (is) a major, mature institution with legal, accounting and information systems that provide the controls they need for accountability. While these institutions must be held fully accountable, layers of micro-management inhibit action and impede adaptation.

New York State Commission on Higher Education (2007)

SUNY as Gulliver

In 1726, Jonathan Swift published Gulliver’s Travels, a satirical satire disguised as a fanciful travelogue. Gulliver's first destination was the land of the Lilliputts, folk about 1/12th the size of humans. Initially feted, he was subsequently detained for displeasing the Lilliputian king. Charged (falsely) with treason, he was sentenced to be blinded. With the help of friends, he escaped.

This is a tale that comes with stunning visuals. Is there any school child who does not recall the lito of Gulliver lying on his back, restrained by hundreds of ropes manned by hordes of Lilliputians? Even today, it is shocking to observe this great giant, his extraordinary powers negated by countless shackles, reduced to impotence. This is powerful imagery. And this is SUNY today.

I want to say up front that this Gulliver analogy is not intended as a thinly veiled ad hominem attack on any person, any political leader or any political party. No one is to blame, and the blame game is notoriously counterproductive. I believe that SUNY's shackles are an accretion of good intentions, unintended consequences and a (mostly) benign paternalism. However, we got to where we are, the reality is that just when New York most desperately needs a nimble, competitive SUNY, it lies prostrate, every bit as hamstrung as Gulliver.

At first reading, these assertions may strike you as conclusory or hyperbolic; allow me to offer some particulars: SUNY is subject to myriad pre-audit approvals. That means that the Chancellor's Office and individual campuses must secure approvals from other state agencies to do any number of basic activities, including the purchase of goods costing more than $10K. The result is mindless delay. Typical examples: the Crane School of Music at SUNY Potsdam could not buy pianos without permission from the Comptroller, a process that consumed three years; it took SUNY Upstate Medical University five months to secure the Comptroller's permission to purchase a desperately needed CT scan for its Emergency Room; SUNY Downstate Medical Center was forced to wait months for permission to purchase stents.

The contracts drawn by SUNY lawyers are reviewed by lawyers working for the Comptroller and the Attorney General. SUNY Maritime agreed (for $250K) to survey all the ports in New York City, but had to wait ten months before the Comptroller and the Attorney General signed off on the language in the contract. This result, played out again and again in a variety of contexts, should come as no surprise. If your job is to find problems in contracts, it is highly likely that you will find problems in contracts. SUNY is told over and over that it must be more entrepreneurial, more enterprising, more aggressive in generating revenues for itself. One way to do that is to form public/private partnerships that leverage SUNY owned land and SUNY intellectual capital. But SUNY cannot enter into public/private partnerships without authorizing legislation. SUNY Purchase, for example, conceived of a Senior Learning Community that would maximize utilization of its Performing Arts Center and its Neuberger Museum of Arts, each extraordinary in its own right. The centerpiece, senior, faculty and staff housing, would generate
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significant revenue. The public/private partnership that would build it was in place, as were the plans. Sadly, it was all for naught, because the required legislation never became law.

These examples are a few among hundreds, perhaps thousands. The cumulative effect is massive delay and millions in unnecessary expense. To compete globally, SUNY needs to be positioned to act quickly, decisively and boldly. How, conceivably, is it in New York’s interest to wrap SUNY in a regulatory straightjacket?

Worse still, the remedy for what ails SUNY is one that an 18th century physician like Dr. Gulliver would have well understood: SUNY is being bled. In the last two years, state support for SUNY has been cut by $424 million dollars (on a base of about $2 billion dollars). The deficit reduction proposals presently under consideration would cut another $120 million. Cuts of this magnitude inevitably compromise access, affordability and quality, the core missions of SUNY.

The good news (there is some) is that three recent developments portend a new set of possibilities. They are the arrival of Nancy Zimpher as SUNY’s Chancellor, the advent of a visionary strategic plan and a singular piece of legislative architecture that, if adopted, will free SUNY of its debilitating shackles. A word about each:

Nancy Zimpher is dynamism in a bottle. Smart, tough and focused, she has completely altered the usual dynamic between SUNY, the Governor and the Legislature. She has forged a strong, mutually respectful relationship with legislative leaders and, in particular, with Lt. Governor Ravitch and Budget Director Bob Megna. These men understand the enormity of our fiscal problems and the imperative for framing a long-term strategy that balances the state’s financial limitations with the recognition that SUNY is perilously close to a tipping point at which decline becomes irreversible. They have joined us to grapple with the enormously important question of how to reinvigorate SUNY without committing massive new resources.

On April 13, 2010, SUNY unveiled an unprecedented collaboration between and among all the members of the SUNY family that yielded a strategic plan to guide our university for the next decade. It commits SUNY to a set of aspirational and practical goals, infused with serious metrics to ensure both transparency and accountability. It is plain-spoken and powerful. Informing all of it is the recognition of SUNY as New York’s most underutilized strategic asset.

Finally, Governor Paterson has given us a legislative platform that will allow SUNY to manage its own affairs free of suffocating regulation. The Public Higher Education Empowerment and Innovation Act (the SUNY Empowerment Act) represents a sea change in the Executive’s view of SUNY. It recognizes the SUNY board’s fiduciary obligation to manage SUNY’s affairs responsibly, subject to rigorous internal and external audits. It allows SUNY to purchase basic goods and services on its own authority. It incentivizes SUNY to generate (and keep) revenues derived from entrepreneurial activity, to approve rational (small, predictable, indexed) tuition increases and to recognize that certain disciplines and research are more expensive than others to teach and support. Importantly, the principles advanced in the SUNY Empowerment Act have been endorsed by the Executive Committee of the SUNY Faculty Senate and the Student Assembly.

The SUNY Empowerment Act captures the core insight that SUNY is New York’s last, best hope for economic revitalization. A vital SUNY is central to the economic vitality of every community where a SUNY campus is located. Often, SUNY is the major employer in that community and that county. But SUNY is much more. If freed to do so, SUNY is uniquely positioned to create, nurture and commercialize intellectual property. Its research can be an engine for job creation, jobs that will allow New York to emerge from recession and to compete globally.

One need look no further than the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering at UAlbany (CNSE) to grasp the enormity of the potential that SUNY’s research and intellectual capital can unlock. There, the leadership of Alain Kaloyeros has generated $1.5B of public investment, $3.5B of private investment, 4000 new high tech jobs, 250 on-site world class technology companies and the massive AMD chip fabrication plant under construction in Saratoga County. This model is replicable.

It is our duty to preserve and lift this great public institution. SUNY is an irreplaceable cornerstone of our meritocracy. It must be preserved, not only because it is a portal to opportunity for hundreds of thousands of young New Yorkers, but because it is the only public institution capable of reversing the economic tailspin that has wreaked such havoc upon our economy, especially upstate. SUNY has reached adulthood. It has accepted a disproportionate share of cuts, but still it yearns to realize the immense potential to be found on its campuses. The SUNY Empowerment Act will give it a fighting chance.

It is time to free Gulliver.
month, we spent the rest of April touring the state, bringing The Power of SUNY to the people who helped make it all possible. This experience really tied everything together for me. Going back to campuses in all regions of the state confirmed yet again what a remarkable system SUNY is — with its scale, its geographic reach, and its diverse array of offerings. And in each case, these events brought together several campuses, under-scoring the collective resources and impact that can be brought to bear on an entire region.

As we traveled the state, it became even clearer to me that SUNY will be able to leverage our unparalleled resources to create the economic and educational opportunities New York so desperately needs. I have spoken to so many people who are ready to go to work on putting our six “Big Ideas” into action — everyone from teachers to preachers to researchers — and they are excited about being a part of it.

The Power of SUNY is all about this collaborative process — and the fact that everyone has something to contribute. Our faculty will obviously be key to moving us forward in each area, because it is you who will drive our research to the marketplace, create art that is a resource for the community and, above all, teach and mentor the students who will make the great discoveries and author the academic achievements of this century.

But first, we need to begin the next phase of the plan: implementation. Working groups will transition into task forces. And we will be working across the system to align campus strategic plans with The Power of SUNY.

And meanwhile, we will continue to advocate for the Public Higher Education Empowerment and Innovation Act — the enabling legislation for the strategic plan. As you know, the Act provides for SUNY oversight of our tuition policies; support for entrepreneurial partnerships and land use; and more efficient procurement practices. All of these tools will be essential to stabilize SUNY’s finances in the wake of diminishing state support, while allowing us to grow and thrive in ways that will benefit and protect students and our workforce.

I’m going to continue fighting for its passage and for the critical restoration of financial support for SUNY in the state budget, and I
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The Power of SUNY

As you know, last month we launched The Power of SUNY, a strategic plan that will serve as our roadmap for the next five years and guide our development for the next decade. I believe this plan presents a turning point for the State University and for New York — by offering SUNY as a powerful engine of economic revitalization and enhanced quality of life in our communities.

I want to take this opportunity to extend a big thank you to the University Faculty Senate and all of our faculty members across the SUNY system. We could not have come this far without your tremendous support. University Faculty Senate (UFS) President Ken O’Brien played a critical role in the development of the plan as a member of the Strategic Plan Steering Committee, and many other faculty members participated as members of the Group of 200, working groups, panelists and contributors of ideas.

When I accepted the charge given by the SUNY Board of Trustees to move this great university system to global distinction, I said that could never be done by any one person; it would take collective vision and collective action to move us forward. That is why the voices in this plan represent not only our students and our entire SUNY family of distinguished faculty and committed staff, but also the millions of New Yorkers who live and work in close proximity to our 64 campuses.

The release of The Power of SUNY inaugurated the third phase of SUNY’s strategic planning process. After initial launch events in New York City and Albany last
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Advocating for SUNY

I joined SUNY late last year as Senior Vice Chancellor and Chief Operating Officer. The immediate and warm welcome I have received across the System, at each of the campuses I have been able to visit - and even in the communities that our campuses are a part of - has been overwhelming and inspiring.

The University Faculty Senate (UFS) that represents the many faculty and professional staff who serve as teachers and mentors to nearly half a million college students across New York is a group that clearly acts out of dedication to SUNY and a commitment to excellence in higher education. I sincerely applaud their work on your behalf.

I have particularly enjoyed getting to know and working with Dr. Ken O’Brien, the more than able President of the University Faculty Senate. Given Ken’s outstanding teaching credentials, it will come as no surprise that he has taught me a great deal about SUNY, its complex history and political environment. He is an effective and eloquent advocate for the faculty he so proudly represents and embodies the tremendous value that shared governance brings to the decision making process at SUNY Administration. I have benefited enormously from Ken’s gracious outreach as I have transitioned into the Chief Operating Officer position.

Of course, there is a great deal of very serious business to be done at SUNY and there has never been a more challenging economic climate in which to do it.

Though the April 1st deadline has passed, the Governor, Senate and Assembly continue their work to adopt a state budget that is balanced and responsible. At SUNY, we appreciate the difficulty of their task and we sympathize with the challenges they face. However, we must do all we can to ensure that we are able to continue providing our students with an affordable, accessible college education of the highest quality.

As SUNY faculty and professional staff, you know all too well the extent to which state funding for SUNY has been cut in recent years, and you have seen, first-hand, the affects these cuts have had on the nearly 465,000 students and upwards of 88,000 faculty and staff that make up the SUNY family.

The 64 campuses of SUNY have absorbed $424 million in cuts over the past two years and the Governor’s 2010-11 budget proposed an additional reduction of $210 million. However, there was a silver lining in the Governor’s proposal – the Public Higher Education Empowerment and Innovation Act (PHEEIA), a series of administrative tools that would allow the SUNY trustees to oversee tuition policy and, in general, allow SUNY the ability to become more financially independent, freeing us to cope with funding reductions on our own terms.

The New York State Senate and Assembly agreed to the Governor’s proposed reductions in their one-house budget resolutions, but only the Senate provided many of the PHEEIA tools that would enable SUNY to mitigate the reductions properly administer its finances. The Assembly, while accepting the state support reductions, rejected all the proposed administrative tools. If a budget is enacted that only provides for reductions in state support, without giving SUNY better control over tuition policy, the ability to pursue new revenue sources through public private partnerships, and the right to transact business more efficiently through procurement process reform, we will be left with no choice but to enact strict drastic budget reductions.

We, at System Administration, have been doing all we can to negotiate budget restorations and enactment of PHEEIA with members of the legislature. The advocacy effort on behalf of this legislation has required tremendous efforts by countless people across SUNY, the UFS among them. Together, we have been to breakfasts, lunches and dinners, held meetings, made speeches, gotten Op-Eds and letters to the editor published in newspapers and online. Advocates for SUNY have done radio commentaries and television interviews. Others have created advertisements.

Chancellor Zimpher, myself, our colleagues in Albany and nearly every SUNY campus president has met with and/or written and talked to the state’s most influential legislators, in a major push for budget restorations and PHEEIA. With your help, we have garnered support from many quarters. Our partners, including the Business Council of New York, the Council for Economic Growth, NYS Economic Development Councils, NYS Association of Counties and Regional Chambers of Commerce – and most importantly the University Faculty Senate and the SUNY Student Assembly have passed resolutions and publicly advocated for PHEEIA.

At this juncture, we do not have any reliable information regarding when the legislature might finally pass a budget. We will, however, continue to vigorously advocate for SUNY until the process is complete, and then begin all over again at the start of the following year’s budget process. We are nothing, if not persistent!

I can’t thank you enough for the role you have played in our push for funding and operational independence. Thank you for your continued support as we wait for the final word from our legislative leaders.
For Operations Monica Rimal, both of whom then answered questions from the Senators. Since President O’Brien had already met with Phil Smith, the UUP President, he understood the UUP’s deep concerns about the bill, which he shared with the Executive Committee and the Senators at the Plenary Meeting. After informal polls indicated that while there was support for the bill among UFS Senators at the time of the plenary, the prudent course dictated that the Senate leadership would continue to gather more information, such as the development by SUNY of policies that would be critical in implementing the Act if it were passed, and communicate that information to the Senators as well as to Campus Governance Leaders (CGLs).

In mid-February, the members of the UFS Expanded Executive Committee (the Executive Committee plus the chairs of all Standing Committees) met with an executive team from UUP for a lengthy, cordial meeting during which the UUP objections to the pending legislation were specified. In addition, the UFS Expanded Executive Committee received a copy of the letter that President Phil Smith was sending to UUP members throughout the system during the following week. Through the letter, as well as other communications and actions, it became apparent that the UUP’s concerns had crystallized into opposition to most of the critical elements of PHEEIA, with the exception of relaxation of procurement procedures, which they endorsed.

On March 2, the members of the UFS Expanded Executive Committee met with Senior Vice Chancellor Rimal, before which they had received copies of two policies, the Comprehensive Tuition Policy and the Comprehensive Asset Management Policy, which were being drafted for the Act’s implementation. Following that meeting the Expanded Executive Committee drafted an email that was a “Compilation of Comments on PHEEIA,” which was sent to Senior Vice Chancellor Rimal. She had indicated that the policies were still “in draft,” and as such, she welcomed any commentary the UFS would offer. The UFS Expanded Executive Committee had authorized President O’Brien to create a four column chart that identified the major elements of the Act, the positions
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Resolution of the University Faculty Senate Executive Committee on the Public Higher Education Empowerment and Innovation Act
March 30, 2010

Whereas state support for the SUNY state-operated campuses has been cut by $424 million over the past three years and the 2010-2011 Executive Budget recommends an additional reduction of more than $170 million; and

Whereas these reductions threaten SUNY’s ability to offer its students an affordable education of the highest quality; and

Whereas a recent New York State budget gap was partially closed by a tuition increase, most of which was kept by the State Treasury; and

Whereas the projected New York State budget deficit is $9 billion in the next year, due to the slow pace of economic recovery and the cessation of federal stimulus funds; and

Whereas the proposed New York State Public Higher Education Empowerment and Innovation Act, along with the accompanying Comprehensive Tuition Policy and the Comprehensive Asset Management Policy seek to:

- depoliticize tuition rates by moving the authorizing power from New York State to the State University Board of Trustees and moving the tuition income “off-budget,” and

- create an equitable and rational tuition policy through the General Tuition Rate, which would yield modest and predictable tuition increases, as opposed to the large sudden increases designed to help close a budget gap for New York State, and

- enable the University to undertake land leases without special legislation for projects not in conflict with campus missions, to enter joint ventures and public/private partnerships, and to eliminate burdensome and redundant pre-approval of Construction Fund contracts; and

- provide protection from liability for students participating in clinical internships related to their field of study, facilitate hospital participation in joint ventures and managed care to provide health care related services, and eliminate burdensome and duplicative pre-approval of SUNY hospital contracts, including those involving real property transactions, and

- fund SUNY-Aid with a portion of the expected tuition increase to reduce the burden of these increases on economically disadvantaged students, and

- facilitate the speedy and cost-effective purchase of materials and services

Therefore, be it resolved that the University Faculty Senate’s Executive Committee endorses the principles of the Public Higher Education Empowerment and Innovation Act, and requests that the Chancellor and her staff address six outstanding issues of special concern:

- The need to define Special Tuition Rate more precisely and provide a cap;

- The need to specify the inclusion of faculty governance in the campus decision-making processes that will produce recommendations for both tuition rates and/or public-private partnerships or any associated land leases;

- The need to ensure that the oversight of public-private partnerships require adherence to all relevant environmental laws and to ‘best environmental practices;’

- The need to ensure that all rights and benefits of collective bargaining in the current labor contracts be extended to all future negotiated labor contracts; and,

- The need for a commitment on the part of New York State to a future level of funding that would constitute a continuing “maintenance of effort.”

- The need to apply evenly the benefits of PHEEIA across all sectors of SUNY.

155-03-1: Passed with two dissenting votes, April 24, 2010
In a world where Plutonomics prevails, the misguided application of business and economic principles to education policy is not improving education for all children, yet the trend to demonize public schools and tout privatized alternatives continues. This trend started 30 years ago with the report, “A Nation at Risk,” with its rhetorical “rising tide of mediocrity” and the “trickle down” policies of Reagonomics, which reached an apex just before the economic crash of 2008. This is not a conspiracy theory. Politics, economics, and public policy are interconnected.

A Citizen’s memo to investors, “Revisiting Plutonomics: The Rich Getting Richer,” dated March 5, 2006, states the “rising profit share and favorable treatment by market-friendly governments” that have allowed the rich to prosper and become a greater share of the economy in Plutonomy countries.” The memo applauds all “who lead the charge in converting globalization and technology to increase the profit share of the economy at the expense of labor” as contributing to plutonomy. Educators and children belong to the group the memo cites as “labor.” A public education system that is enslaved by a contrived obsession with test scores on dumbed-down tests designed by for-profit corporations cannot respond to a media barrage of antilocution, the content of which is that the education system is failing; and a media-soaked populace is all too willing to believe that the failure of the education of its children is to blame for the decline in its standard of living rather than the greedy adults who engineered an unjust economic and political system. This is one area where there are no red or blue sides. Everyone believes that the schools are failing. The plutonomy wins.

“A Nation at Risk” was commissioned by President Reagan to achieve such goals as bringing God back into the classroom, promoting vouchers for tuition tax credits for private schools. On the campaign trail, Reagan, who was purported to have not even read the report, gave 51 speeches calling for education reform (Zhao, 2008). This served to discredit an educational system that, at the time, comprised almost every American child between the ages of 5 and 18, and that graduated 85% from high school – better performance than any other country on earth (PBS, 2001). The persistent call for more “choice” and for funneling public money to private schools permeated the media for the next decade. There were responses from academe, most notably, the excellent book, The Manufactured Crisis (1996) that tried to present the data, but just as on the playground when a bully is belittling a weakling, those who had nothing to lose by joining in paid no attention to the reality. In that context, many joined the bandwagon to smear teachers and the places where they are educated. This is not to say that there were and are no bad teachers – far from it; but they were clearly highlighted and held up to build momentum and open doors for more privatization and even for-profit endeavors. There is no evidence that charters or other inexpensive private options are more effective than public schools. (Stanford University Center for Research on Education Outcomes, 2009; Gabriel, NY Times, May 1, 2010.) Almost all for-profit educational ventures failed in the 1990’s, but even in the face of that reality, the leitmotif of the benefits of competition among schools and the free market transposed to schools as a saving idea for a failed system became an ingrained “fact” in the public psyche.

Teacher Education was not immune to the attacks, and I experienced it personally. In 1999, I was invited by the chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the SUNY Board of Trustees to go to its meeting in New York City to respond to a woman I knew well through the NCTE committee mentioned above. She had written a book positing the thesis that multicultural curriculum led to illiteracy and lowered educational standards and was a partial explanation for the “failure” of our schools. I prepared my response to the anticipated remarks and went to the meeting. When I entered the room, I was informed that the agenda had been changed, a common occurrence at that time, and that I would be responding to another person, the author of Ed School Follies, a book ridiculing schools of education and based on isolated egregious examples of mis-education pulled from unknown sources. I sat through accusations of “Mickey Mouse” syllabi and the meager attributes of applicants to schools of education, and the typical gibes of “those who can’t, teach.” The author, obviously relishing her book ridiculing schools of education and the typical anecdotes of those who cannot be teachers. It is so obvious that the question is not how, but why this has occurred with such fury and vigor.

This section provides a mechanism for communication among faculty, professional staff, and administrators. In includes ideas and comments on issues that are of system-wide relevance or interest. The views and comments expressed in this section are not necessarily those of the editors, the Executive Committee, or of the University Faculty Senate. Submissions and comments regarding articles in this section should be addressed to the editors and should not exceed 1,500 words.
inadequate with no evidence in the hope of designing different programs based on no evidence. A recent report from the NY State Education Department and the Board of Regents, “Transforming Teaching and Ensuring an Equitable Distribution of Qualified Teachers in New York State” proposes funding for cultural institutions, research centers, and not-for-profit organizations to partner with schools of education to pilot field-based certification programs that will align with its proposed performance-based assessments for teacher candidates. In some cases, The Board of Regents will grant authority for unaccredited institutions to grant master’s degrees to teacher candidates, yet the report cites no research on which these recommendations are based. The NCATE accredited schools of education would not have to be involved. NCATE criteria for accreditation are derived from every professional organization in every academic discipline and are some of the most stringent, research-based standards in the world; yet the proposal cites no research for funding alternatives to the NCATE accredited institutions. This is not a new idea. A similar policy is in effect in California, where it has resulted in narrowed curricula in the alternative teacher education programs that basically parallel what has happened in K-12 education as a result of “No child left behind” (NCLB): teaching to the test – turning education into training. The NCLB policies have already re-legged a generation of students to an education that teaches them that, if they “pass” the test, they have learned something. Now the same is proposed for their teachers and also outsources their preparation for the assessments. Where is the evidence that this outsourcing of teacher education is effective? A better model would be to encourage schools of education to form partnerships with other institutions such as museums and some businesses to reconfigure their programs to be more clinically based, but to also include higher academic standards and a focus on the teacher as scholar. Teachers, after all, are in the business of scholarship and they are developing the minds of unpredictable human beings. Teachers need to have well-developed minds and the ability to think critically on their feet in order to address the complexities of their vocation. These policies seem to assume that placing pre-service teachers in classrooms and teaching them algorithms to respond to situations that might appear on the assessments will work better than teaching them high level content and pedagogy in colleges concurrently with extensive field experiences. I taught in Holmes Group teacher education programs at Teachers College, Columbia University and at Trinity University in San Antonio Texas. These were graduate programs that were expensive. Where is the policy that provides funding for our public colleges to mount this kind of program? Unequal funding is a primary factor in the unequal quality of K-12 schools. Our public universities offer very high quality programs despite the inadequate funding they endure. There needs to be more dialogue between the New York State Education Department (NYSED), the Board of Regents, and school of education deans, faculty and students. Wouldn’t it be wonderful if the Regents and NYSED folks made a tour of schools of education across the state and really saw and experienced what is being taught, how and to whom? NCATE does that when it accredits our colleges. Our chancellor had the energy, passion and wisdom to visit all our campuses on her impressive SUNY tour. I am hopeful that the national commission she is chairing will reach sound conclusions and make recommendations based on research and sound educational theory and that funding will follow. I also hope that she is involved in conversations with NYSED and the Board of Regents on how SUNY and its schools of education can lead the way in reforming teacher education in a positive direction.

References

Fiorello H. La Guardia: New York’s Phenomenon Daniel S. Marrone, Farmingdale

A phenomenon is defined as a rare, gifted individual with remarkable talent. All New Yorkers have benefited from such a person. He was Fiorello Enrico La Guardia. The “Little Flower” was born on December 11, 1882, in New York City’s Little Italy. Throughout his 64 very productive years of life, Fiorello, who would later change his middle name to “Henry,” championed the “underdog” – the immigrant, the poor living in filthy slums, the unrepresented in the halls of government, the traveler who needs a New York airport, a high schooler wishing to be a musician… The list could go on much further. Perhaps his greatest contribution to the political scene was his pivotal role in opening the electorate to ethnic diversity and for protecting the rights of those previously underserved and unprotected. He enjoyed being among people, regardless of where they were from or how they worshipped. In his politically formative years as U.S. Congressman representing first lower and then later, upper, Manhattan, he rejoiced in the city’s ethnic melting pot. Taking this ideal further, the “Little Flower” perceived immigrants as good for building and sustaining America and American ideals. Born on New York City’s Manhattan Island but raised in the Arizona Territories, La Guardia possessed an innate intelligence that enabled him to be a supremely capable leader and serve as a role model for all future mayors of America’s cities. Fiorello effectively communicated with diverse audiences in English, Italian, Croatian, German, and Yiddish. He was able to win widespread support from first and second generation ethnic communities as well as the good government types, the “goo goos,” such as Judge Samuel Seabury who led the early 1930’s Seabury Commission hearings. A consummate politician, La Guardia helped transformed the accepted definition of being “American.” During his early years as an attorney and congressman, he witnessed racial hatred and discrimination. In response, he became a stalwart defender of the rights of minorities throughout his 30-year political career. As he was born to a hybrid ethnic mix of Italian and Austro-Hungarian nationalities as well as Roman Catholic and Jewish religions, Fiorello was cognizant throughout his life of being different. Among these differences was certainly the aspect of religion. In fact, religiosity was a major element in his life. Since his mother was Jewish, he was according to Hebrew law, in fact, Jewish. However, Fiorello’s Roman Catholic lapsed father, while serving as a bandmaster in the U.S. Army, raised his sister, brother, and him in the “more-mainstream” American Protestant Episcopal Church. La Guardia’s ethnicity and “American-ness” are addressed by his biographers. For example, Thomas Kessner in, Fiorello H. La Guardia and the Making of Modern New York, notes that: La Guardia’s own ethnic identity was complicated. Had someone asked him, he would have insisted simply that he was an American. But in the tribal twenties being born in New York City and being raised on an army post was not sufficient to dispel a lingering sense of alienness. Swarthy complexion, jet-black hair, European
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parentage, uncertain religious persuasion (not to mention the un-American practice of having run on four or five party tickets, including that of the Socialists!), and a last name punctuated by no less than five vowels were enough to see to that. Moreover, even for La Guardia the answer was not so simple. His sense of being something other than simply American came not only from those who taunted him. Raised in a home steeped in European culture and traditions, he grew up with an awareness of being different. (1989, p. 117)

As a U. S. Congressman, his legislative achievements included the Norris-La Guardia Act that prohibits workers from being forced into signing anti-union, “Yellow Dog Contracts.” Not afraid of going against the majority, La Guardia fought an uphill battle against the enactment of immigration quotas. His was one of only six congressional votes against the ethnically restrictive Immigration Act of 1924 (Johnson-Reed Act). La Guardia was also a vocal critic of the plan submitted to congress by Treasury Secretary Andrew W. Mellon to lower income taxes for only wealthy individuals. As mayor, he directed Police Commissioner Lewis J. Valentine to root out gangsters, collectively called, “Murder, Inc.,” and their illegal gambling operations. He is credited with the construction of government-subsidized public housing throughout the five boroughs. La Guardia was directly responsible for the Big Apple’s two international airports, one of which bears his name. A strong proponent of music education, he had a direct hand in establishing the country’s premier music and arts high school that also bears his name. This specialized high school, nicknamed, “La G,” was featured prominently in the popular 1980 movie, Fame, which was remade in 1999. In conjunction with his autocratic but highly effective Parks Commissioner, Robert Moses, the mayor was able to deliver to the city literally hundreds of parks, playgrounds, highways, and bridges. Kessner asserts that “La Guardia was one of a generation of extraordinarily gifted New Yorkers who helped usher in the liberal era in American history. Frances Perkins, Harry Hopkins, Adolf Berle, Henry Morgenthau, Herbert Lehman, Robert Moses, Al Smith, and of course, Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt, despite their disagreements, shared the sense that government must assume wider responsibility for those citizens who could not care for themselves” (1989, p. xii).

As a staunch advocate for good government and voraciously against corruption by those in government, La Guardia shivered at the unwritten “Gotham City Law” that no reformer could be re-elected. He was elected seven times to the U. S. Congress; once as President of the N.Y.C. Board of Aldermen; and three times as mayor of America’s largest city. As a close political supporter of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the four-term president’s New Deal policies, Fiorello helped the city overcome financial collapse and the gridlock of infrastructure development during the tense years of the Great Depression and World War II. La Guardia’s well-known WNYC radio signoff message was “Patience and Fortitude.” This is what he lived by after losing elections and being denied political appointments. Beyond these setbacks, he faced traumatic family losses. His first wife, Thea, and daughter, Fioretta, both succumbed to tuberculosis within the same disastrous year, 1921. Tragedy was soon followed by glaring public disputes with sitting Republican Party New York State Governor Nathan L. Miller. That year he also lost the GOP mayoral primary. After family tragedies and political setbacks in 1921, he fought back winning a seat in congress in the hotly contested three-way November 1922 election. From 1923 to 1933, he served one congressional term as an American Labor Party candidate and four terms as a Republican. He was closely allied with the Progressive Movement and Wisconsin Senator Robert Marion “Fighting Bob” La Follette. Losing his congressional seat for the 73rd U.S. Congress amidst the 1933 Democrat landslide, La Guardia soon once again re-entered the political landscape by being elected New York City mayor. In this challenging role for 12 years, he inexorably helped rebuild and reform America’s most populous city. Fiorello roundly denounced “chiselers and tinhorns” and their tainted money, the Little Flower fought crime through honest government and by example. All his life, he lived a decidedly modest, middle-class life style with correspondingly solid ethical values.

Eight years after the death of his first wife and daughter, Fiorello remained single, and, with second wife, Marie, adopted a girl and a boy. They raised their children “La Guardia-style” – middle class, non-ostentatious, and nurturing. At the end of 1945, after a dozen years as mayor, his energy was sapped and his body was racked with illness. But he refused to stop helping those in need. From March through December 1946, the former mayor gave his remaining strength as Director General of the newly formed United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Dynamic, restless, and spirited throughout his life, this supernova phenomenon of energy had to eventually come to an end. This happened 83 days before his 65th birthday due – officially – to pancreatic cancer. But to New Yorkers, he ended his civic duty after giving his “all” for his city and for America. “At 8:06 on the morning of September 20, 1947, the 5-5-5-5 bell, repeated four times, sounded on the signal system of the New York City Fire Department. It was the traditional announcement of mourning, which marks the death of a fireman in the line of duty or the passing of an important city official” (Rodman, 1962, p. 236). This was one of many tributes given then and since to “Hizzoner.” Melvin G. Holli, in The American Mayor: The Best & the Worst Big-City Leaders. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.


I am not a data collector or number cruncher, but was in a past life when I worked on Wall Street. Consequently my observations are anecdotal and though imprecise, probably correct. In the business world, people are usually paid for what they do (or whom they know) whereas in academia, especially in the humanities and social sciences, people are paid for what they know – which presents a two-pronged problem. How can instructors’ knowledge be measured? How does that knowledge benefit their students? The answer to the first is through publication of books and articles in their field of expertise. This seems a fairly straightforward way of looking at things, but it should be examined more closely. It has become a cliché that much scholarly work is “writing more and more about less and less”. In many cases the publications do not advance knowledge and sometimes their obscurity makes them almost impossible to understand. They remain unread and bring little benefit or relevance to the university or to students.

The other issue is workload and being paid for what one does. This is a loosely defined concept
and hard to quantify. It is easy to measure what scientists do. They teach, they have grants, they spend a lot of time on campus. The parking lots of the science buildings are full days, nights, and weekends. The same cannot be said of those in the Humanities and Social Sciences. Parking lots near these buildings are empty nights and weekends including Fridays and Mondays. Of course, the claim can be made that technology eliminates the necessity of a presence on campus. But what about students who need face-to-face contact after their class time or brief, obligatory office hours?

Faculty work is regulated by a union contract and by a set of priorities agreed upon by University governance (Senate) and the administration. Since the mission of University Centers differs considerably from that of the liberal arts colleges, faculty members at those centers enjoy greater flexibility and freedom. It would be considered outrageous for administration to require faculty to be on campus for 35 hours a week or for a specific number of days per week. In University Centers, “past practice” limits teaching to 2 three-credit courses per semester, or if the department is not involved in graduate education, 3 courses one semester and 2 the following.

These are not good times for SUNY. The recession has reduced tax levy funding drastically. It is not unlikely that adjuncts and part-time faculty will lose their jobs due to fiscal restraints. As a consequence fewer classes will be offered and it will take students longer to graduate. This could create a “perfect storm” that may undermine the credibility of SUNY and cause talented students to look elsewhere for a college education.

Perhaps some of us should think about putting our research on “slow” and consider teaching an extra class or two. It will not hurt us that much and the altruism will signal that we care about what happens to our University and students.

Many will complain that this would be the camel’s nose under the tent, and that it would permanently disrupt the proper balance of teaching and research we have enjoyed for so many years, and that the balance will never return. These are not normal times, and it is not unreasonable to ask faculty to make sacrifices. When the economy recovers, we can hope there will be room for renegotiation.

Meeting with other CGL’s I discovered other options which we used to revise our governance at home for the better.

Knowledge brings power – communicating with fellow CGL’s and Senators provides that knowledge base.

Although there’s a world of wonderful documentation, these meetings are very helpful for knowing what’s important.

Seeing what a meeting looks like when I’m not running it.

Getting perspectives on Community Colleges and CUNY

I get to pester scholars for help with my research.

Finally, the power of attending CGL meetings at the UFS Plenary is well-stated by a CGL who wrote: “This is my 4th (and last, at least for now) Plenary and I’ve learned something valuable in each one. Just about every initiative our executive committee has undertaken in the past academic year has been informed, and transformed, by the conversations and suggestions from other CGL’s, interested Senators, and UFS Leadership. I’ve done a better job as CGL because of my experiences at UFS Plenaries. Thanks!”

We hope that more CGL’s will find the advantages of participating in future meetings at the UFS Plenary.
SUNY Undergraduates: Shaping New York’s Future: A Showcase of Scholarly Posters

Kane Gillespie, Stony Brook
Chair, Undergraduate Academic Program and Policies Committee

The Undergraduate Programs and Policies Committee members are pleased to report that the primary agenda item for 2009-10 was a huge success! We invited each of the 64 campuses to participate by selecting a representative few of their own undergraduate students to display projects to legislators and other Albany dignitaries in the Legislative Office Building. Following one year of planning, 150 students and 85 faculty mentors representing 32 SUNY campuses convened on April 13, 2010 in the "well" of the LOB for SUNY Undergraduates Shaping New York’s Future: A Showcase of Scholarly Posters. Although each campus was responsible for travel expenses for participants, the value generated by a relatively small expense was extremely high for faculty, students, legislators, SUNY and the Undergraduate Committee (about $15,000, not including campus expenses, which are estimated at $400-$500 per participant).

Using data from poster submissions, we produced a Journal of Proceedings for participants and attendees that includes the project titles, abstracts, authors and faculty mentor names. In addition, we plan to compile a website with titles, abstracts, authors and faculty mentor names. In addition, we plan to compile a website with photos, videos and attendee comments as an online report of the event. We also plan to send a Chancellor-autographed Certificate to each participating student and faculty member.

The success of the project is due to invaluable assistance, advice and input from Carol Donato, Tim Tryjankowski (subcommittee chair) and all members of the undergraduate committee. We congratulate the students and faculty for their continued success in undergraduate research and scholarship, and hope that this event can be re-established in the coming year.

IN THE SPOTLIGHT

Committee on Ethics and Institutional Integrity
Janet Nepkie, SUNY Oneonta
Chair

Committee Charge: The committee will study and make recommendations to the SUNY University Faculty Senate President regarding issues of professional behavior, ethical conduct and institutional integrity as they relate to faculty, students, administrators and other personnel in SUNY and higher education. The committee will gather information and serve as a resource for the Senate and the University. The Committee will not serve as a disciplinary body nor will it take part in judicial proceedings. The Committee’s area of activity and interest will be quite broad and will include but not be limited to the following areas as they pertain to the State University of New York:

- Curriculum
- Academic honesty
- Research, scholarship and creative activity
- Instructional, institutional and operational policies and practices
- Personal integrity
- Electronic communication
- Confidentiality
- Use of university resources
- Conflicts of interest and commitment
- Financial transactions
- Impact on the environment
- Hiring and admissions practices

The Committee on Ethics and Institutional Integrity was formed as an ad hoc committee in 2007 by Carl Wiezalis, the University Faculty Senate President at that time. Wiezalis felt that the University Faculty Senate should play a leadership role in responding to ethical questions that might arise in SUNY. He asked the committee to study and make recommendations regarding ethical issues in the academy. The faculty whom he approached to serve on the committee had many ideas about how the committee might function, but two ideas were especially central to the design of the new committee: (1) the committee would not serve in a judicial or disciplinary capacity, and (2) the committee would address ethical issues found in all constituencies of SUNY, including faculty, administration and students.

Within the first two years of its existence, the Ethics ad hoc
committee distributed a survey to determine “ethical concerns” to
to all four-year and two-year SUNY
schools. The data gathered from
the survey were used to identify
ethical issues the committee would
address in the future.

The committee studied policies on “ethics” and “ethical conduct” at
colleges and universities throughout
the country as it moved to formulate
recommendations to the Senate
President. The committee considered
the formation of a SUNY Senate
Ethics Institute to help support
continuing study of ethical issues.

**Report to the Extended Executive Committee on Academic Freedom
at SUNY:** In Fall 2009, the newly-
elected University Faculty Senate,
President Kenneth O’Brien, asked
Schools. The data gathered from
all four-year and two-year SUNY
determine “ethical concerns” to
Higher Education:

- **Speaker:** SUNY Assistant Counsel
  Joseph Storch will provide legal
  guidelines for the use of technology
  in higher education. He will discuss
  issues of electronic privacy, as well
  as the ethics and legality of anony-
  mous electronic commentary found
  in “blogs” and websites such as
  “Rate My Professor.”

  - Panelists will comment on the
    issues that animated the conference,
    and the speaker and panelists will
    respond to audience questions and
    observations.

- **Panelists:**
  - Andrew Fitz-Gibbon, Associate
    Professor of Philosophy, SUNY
    Cortland
  - James Greenberg, Director for
    Teaching, Learning and Technology,
    SUNY Oneonta
  - E. Thomas Moran, Founding
    Director, Institute for Ethics in
    Public Life, SUNY Plattsburgh

  A detailed summary of the
  results of the presentations and
  discussions at this symposium will
  be included in the Fall 2011 issue
  of the Bulletin.

**Survey to Identify Existing
Ethical Study and Initiatives at
SUNY:** As a result of its survey, the
committee learned that many SUNY
 campuses have already included a
study of ethical issues as part of
course offerings. Some SUNY cam-
puses have created Ethics Institutes
and others are engaged in innova-
tive projects integrating ethics into
academic study and professional
practice. In an effort to learn more
about SUNY campus accomplish-
ments with ethical issues, the
committee will distribute a survey to all
Chief Academic Officers on SUNY
campuses in 2010.

**Proposals to form partnerships
with other Educational Institu-
tions:** The committee is studying
the possibility of forming partner-
ships with other respected educa-
tional institutions throughout the
country that have already achieved
significant accomplishment in the
study and practice of ethics.

**Future Seminars:** The committee
is making plans for a seminar in
2011 or 2012 entitled “Ethics at
SUNY.” The topics addressed at
this seminar will be broad enough
to address ethical considerations of
faculty, administration and students.

- Members of the Committee on
  Ethics and Institutional Integrity
  represent an especially diverse
  combination of professional
  interests and accomplishment. The
  committee is always pleased to
  welcome new members.

- **Members of the 2009-2010
  Committee on Ethics and
  Institutional Integrity**
  - Janet Nepkie, Chair, Oneonta
  - William Baumer, University at
    Buffalo
  - Andrew Fitz-Gibbon, Cortland
  - Sara Grethlien, Upstate Medical
    University
  - Charles Moran, Cobleskill
  - Thomas Moran, Plattsburgh
  - Kathleen Powderly, Downstate Medical Center
  - Peter Thomas, System Administration
  - Pam Schnell, Optometry
  - Marti Ellerman, Advisor, System Administration

State University of New York at
New Paltz

**Eric Gullickson,**
Director of Media Relations

**Rose Rudnitzki,**
University Faculty Senator

**Glenn Geher,** Professor and Chair of
Psychology and Director of
Evolutionary Studies

Walking across campus one week-
end, this spring, I (Rose Rudnitzki)
encountered a woman who was
part of a campus tour for prospec-
tive students and their parents. “I
can’t get my bearings. I graduated
from here 20 years ago and every-
thing looks different. My daughter
wants to come here, but it looks
like a different place from the New
Paltz I went to.” That encounter
epitomizes today’s SUNY New
Paltz. It is truly new in many ways;
yet it is still SUNY New Paltz.

Founded in 1828 “in a valley
fair,” New Paltz is the 99th oldest
college in the country. First as a
Classical School on the second
floor of the New Paltz Common
School, and then, in 1833, as an
Academy chartered by the New
York State Board of Regents with
its own building on the Wallkill
River, New Paltz Academy produced
many teachers even then for the
Hudson Valley region. Then, as
now, New Paltz was a little different,
offering a liberal arts curriculum in
its Normal School that was unique
for its time.

In 1906, after burning down
twice, the New Paltz Normal School
was rebuilt at its current location
one mile from the Wallkill River,
which flows through the town. The
original building, our beloved Old
Main, was state-of-the-art for its
time. It is now closed for extensive
renovations and will once again be
state-of-the-art when it reopens in
2011 and the School of Education
returns to its home there. Like its
eight sister institutions, New Paltz
was named a State Teachers Col-
lege and joined the nascent State
University of New York in 1948.

**New Paltz’s Vision:** The more
recent changes the mother on a
campus tour saw and sensed did
not result from a fire that burned
down the campus, but instead are
the result of the fire of vision. The
college not only looks different, it
“feels” different. The changes to the
academic culture and ambiance
along with the extraordinary changes
in the student body of the college
were the result of years of planning
and effort that solidified with the
vision of Steven Poskanzer, New
Paltz’s outgoing president. His
eight point vision has driven the
academic changes that made New
Paltz the highly selective liberal arts
college that it is today. They are,
briefly:

- **Continuing to raise the academic
  quality and selectivity of New
  Paltz’s students.** As New Paltz
recruits stronger students, it
also strives to maintain its socio-
-economic, ethnic, geographic and
intellectual diversity. International
students constitute three percent
of the undergraduate student
body and are a key ingredient in
the diverse mix. Still, New Paltz’s
primary mission is to serve the
State of New York, and 93 per-
cent of its students come from
this state.

- **Hiring and retaining faculty who
  are committed to both their
  scholarship and teaching.**

  New Paltz hired 33 new faculty in
2008 and 14 new faculty in
2009.

Continued on page 14
Teaching a curriculum that prepares students for their careers and lives.

Linking student intellectual growth with faculty scholarship.

Sustaining a residential character that reinforces educational goals.

Meeting student needs: New Paltz offers a rich co-curriculum that reinforces what students learn in the classroom, reflects their interests, and takes full advantage of the university’s physical setting.

Addressing regional economic and schooling needs.

Being a cultural and intellectual hub for the Hudson Valley. In keeping with this vision point, New Paltz instituted the Center for Research, Regional Education and Outreach (CRREO). Under the direction of Dr. Gerald Benjamin, the center’s research mission is to: conduct studies on topics of regional interest; bring visibility and focus to these matters; foster communities working together to better serve citizenry; and advance the public interest in our region.

Academic Programs: The above goals also set the foundation for innovations in academic programming in every college and school of SUNY New Paltz. One striking example is our interdisciplinary Evolutionary Studies (EvoS) minor. Since its official inception in Fall of 2007, SUNY New Paltz’s Evolutionary Studies program has quickly become one of the most highly enrolled interdisciplinary minors at the college. This program, the second of its kind in the country, is modeled after the original program at Binghamton University, developed and directed by David Sloan Wilson. Wilson, a world-renowned evolutionary biologist and co-PI on the NSF grant, and David Sloan Wilson, Director of EvoS Binghamton and PI on the NSF grant, to edit a special issue of Evolution: Education and Outreach, published by Springer. This special issue, which will focus on the EvoS Consortium, is due out in 2011.

At New Paltz, the EvoS program includes courses and faculty from several departments, including Anthropology, Biology, Black Studies, English, Geology, History, Philosophy, Psychology, and Theatre Arts. The capstone course in the program is the Evolutionary Studies Seminar, which has become so popular that we now offer and fill four sections each Spring. This course includes lectures (which are open to the public) given by renowned scholars in the field of evolution. Significantly, the speakers in the EvoS Seminar Series represent varied academic disciplines - a fact that underscores the interdisciplinary nature of evolutionary studies. Recent speakers have included Gordon Gallup (Psychologist at SUNY Albany), Richard Wrangham (Anthropologist at Harvard), and Marlene Zuk (Biologist at UC Riverside). Public lectures in this series draw an average of 150 attendees. These seminars are followed by receptions that allow students and other attendees to converse with the speakers in an informal setting.

We have reason to be optimistic about the future of EvoS New Paltz. Enrollments are still increasing and students across varied majors find common ground in the parameters of the program. An important element of the program includes curricular enhancing activities such as hikes into local natural areas, caving adventures into the deep Devonian epoch, and field trips to natural history museums. That’s what EvoS people do.

Currently, the faculty of the program are in the process of applying for a new NSF grant that will increase the ability of EvoS to expand beyond the boundaries of its SUNY homes at New Paltz and Binghamton. For more information – and for links to the “EvoS blogs,” including “Building Darwin’s Bridges,” written by New Paltz EvoS Director, Glenn Geher, please check out evostudies.org.

Not all programs at SUNY New Paltz are new. New Paltz continues to offer a world class education in its classic and traditional programs in the NCATE accredited School of Education, which has established partnerships with several school districts (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9MgJeLZQyA), in which a joint new master’s degree in Special Education and Literacy was recently launched: the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, which recently celebrated the 40th anniversary of its Black Studies Department (http://www.newpaltz.edu/blackstudies/), the School of Fine and Performing Arts, home of the program in Metals ranked #1 in the nation by US News and World Reports (http://www.newpaltz.edu/metal/); The School of Science and Engineering, with its Solar Car Racing team that competes with its SUNY Hawk vehicle (http://www.newpaltz.edu/solarcar/photos.html); and the School of Business, with its many corporate and community partnerships and the Leadership Institute that provides leadership development to businesses in the region (http://www.newpaltz.edu/schoolofbusiness/corporate.html).

The Physical Campus

Supporting Academics and Student Development: It is no wonder that a returning graduate could not find her way around the campus. In addition to changes in its academic core and student profile, New Paltz has recently experienced an unprecedented construction boom. In addition to the renovation of Old Main, there is an entirely new structure on the concourse between the Haggerty Administration and Student Union Buildings. This glass structure, called the “Aerie,” which reflects the shape of the surrounding mountains, has won architectural awards and is reflected in the college’s new logo.

In conjunction with its very student-centered approach to the sciences, the physical plant for science instruction is also experiencing a renaissance at New Paltz. A new Science and Engineering Building is being designed with interdisciplinary, interactive teaching labs to facilitate student research and collaboration. This building will also be LEED certified. SUNY New Paltz opened the John R. Kirk Planetarium in 2007 in the center of the campus, and, on April 23, 2010, opened the Muriel Smolen Observatory on the south end of the campus. The observatory has four telescopes available for night sky viewing. These facilities support a new minor in Astronomy as well as other programs, especially in teacher education.

The Sojourner Truth Library will be also renovated in the next phase of campus improvements to further support New Paltz’s academic mission. All the above improvements are in the context of a campus Master Plan that features conservation of our wetlands and a focus on green space and integrating with the natural beauty of the campus setting.

Over the last several years, each of the elements of the vision for SUNY New Paltz has fallen into place. The college’s academic quality and its reputation are steadily rising and New Paltz’s aspirations are well on their way to becoming a reality.

The glass structure shown below is called the “Aerie.” It reflects the shape of the surrounding mountains, has won architectural awards and is reflected in the college’s new logo.
Launch of the SUNY Strategic Plan

At the Plenary, Chancellor Nancy Zimpher provided a power-point presentation of the SUNY Strategic Plan, titled “The Power of SUNY.” A summary of that plan can be found at the SUNY website.

Committee and Sector Reports

Reports of the Standing Committees and the five sectors (Colleges of Technology, Health Sciences Centers, Special and Statutory Colleges, University Centers, and University Colleges) are available at the UFS website, where other useful information may be found (www.suny.edu/facultysenate).

Substantive Resolutions Considered

Resolution of the University Faculty Senate on the Public Higher Education Empowerment and Innovation Act (see page 7).

Resolution on Presidential Searches, Guidelines for Conducting

Introduction:
The Governance Committee has been advised by SUNY Legal Counsel that during any presidential search there is close communication between the Chancellor’s office, the Search committee chair and the College Council chair. Any modifications to the Guidelines are discussed with the Office of the Chancellor.

Resolution:
Resolved, the University Faculty Senate recommends the Chancellor advance to the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York that the name of Document 8400 in the Policy Manual, Presidential Searches, Guidelines for Conducting be changed to Presidential Searches, Requirements for Conducting.

Be it further resolved that the Chancellor recommend to the State University Board of Trustees that the portion of Document 8400 that reads “Taking care to assure that faculty representation on the search committee speaks for a broad spectrum of faculty opinion, the faculty shall elect its representatives to the search committee by secret ballot at an open session of the faculty governance group, at which a quorum of the teaching faculty are present.”

The Governance Committee has been advised by SUNY Legal Counsel that during any presidential search there is close communication between the Chancellor’s office, the Search committee chair and the College Council chair. Any modifications to the Guidelines are discussed with the Office of the Chancellor.

Search committee by secret ballot in a process developed in consultation with the campus governance body.”

Be it further resolved, the University Faculty Senate supports the minimum constituents of search committees as suggested in the Presidential Searches, Guidelines for Conducting, including “six members of the full-time teaching faculty of the campus,” but also encourages the consideration by the Chancellor of additional faculty representation on presidential search committees. The appointment of additional members by the chairperson should be done in consultation with the campus governance body.

155-01-1: Passed without dissent, April 24, 2010

Election of the UFS Vice President/Secretary

Norman Goodman, sociologist at Stony Brook University, was elected to an unprecedented third term as Vice President/Secretary of the UFS. He is also a Senator from Stony Brook, the first Carl P. Wiezalis University Faculty Senate Fellow, and Co-editor of this Bulletin. Norm has served in the Senate for almost twenty years and was the first faculty member in SUNY to hold two Distinguished Faculty ranks (Distinguished Teaching Professor and Distinguished Service Professor). He is the author/editor of nine books and eighteen articles and book chapters, and had served several terms as a Campus Governance Leader and was chair of his department for twenty years.

Announcements

Outstanding art by SUNY students

The State University of New York honored three students for exemplary achievement in the Arts, with the presentation of this year’s Thayer Fellowship in the Arts and Patricia Kerr Ross Awards. Each year, a Thayer Fellowship in the amount of $7,000 is awarded to one student, or shared among several students, who demonstrate outstanding achievement and high professional potential in the arts. The Patricia Kerr Ross Award, for $1,000, is given to a student, or shared among several students, who have demonstrated excellence, originality, and promise in the arts. Both awards are intended as a bridge between SUNY study in the arts and entry into a professional career in the arts.

“it is a great pleasure to provide some of our most creative arts students with financial assistance as they face the challenges that come with professional life and we wish this year’s winners success as they begin their new careers,” said SUNY Chancellor Nancy L. Zimpher. “Congratulations to both of these talented SUNY students for winning such prestigious and competitive awards.”

“The quality of the artistic work of this year’s winners is truly outstanding,” said Artistic Director and SUNY Potsdam Distinguished Service Professor of Art Joseph Hildreth. “The panel of judges made difficult decisions among many fine submissions, but in the end they chose very well. SUNY, and its outstanding faculty, can take great pride in the achievement of our very talented students as they make their way in the world.”

This year’s Thayer Fellowship and Patricia Kerr Ross Award recipients were presented with their awards at the spring SUNY Student Art Reception in Albany. This year, two winners were chosen for the Thayer Fellowship:

- Kathleen Diehl, MFA in Performance and Choreography, SUNY Brockport – Dance
- Benjamin Firer, Bachelors in Music Performance, Education, SUNY Potsdam - Music

The Patricia Kerr Ross Award was awarded to:
- Kevin Zak, BFA in Music Theatre, Theatre Arts, University at Buffalo

About the Thayer Fellowship

The Thayer Fellowship was established in 1985-86 by the late Walter N. Thayer, Chairman of Whitney Communications, New York City, in honor of his wife, Jeanne C. Thayer, who was a SUNY trustee from 1974 to 1984 and an active supporter of the arts. The Thayers wanted to assist SUNY’s most talented young artists at the most difficult period of time for a young Continued on page 16
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professional, when the struggle to make a living can overwhelm even the most dedicated individual. The fellowship helps the artist take advantage of important opportunities.

About the Patricia Kerr Ross Award
Patricia Kerr Ross dedicated 30 years of service to SUNY, where she began in 1969 as Assistant to the University Dean in the University-wide Program in the Arts. Ross directed the University-wide Programs in the Arts from 1971-91, and over the years, was also a board and committee member, panelist and speaker for a variety of arts-related organizations in New York State. She was a founding board member of the Gallery Association of New York State in 1973 and the Association of SUNY Arts Presenters in 1982. Following her death in 1999, Ross’ $30,000 bequest created the Patricia Kerr Ross Award to benefit graduates in the arts by enhancing the outreach of the Thayer Fellowship program.

The artistic director for the Thayer Fellowship and Patricia Kerr Ross Award is Joe Hildreth, a Distinguished Service Professor of Art at Potsdam and a past president of the SUNY University Faculty Senate.

Nearly 100 applications for the awards are received each year. The applications are evaluated by a Jury Panel of experts in the various arts disciplines. The finalists are then interviewed in person by the Jury Panel, and their work is reviewed during performances, readings, screenings, and exhibitions. At the end of this process, the jury panel determines the winners.

The SUNY New Paltz Student Group Absolute Acapella Performs for the Faculty Senate