**PRESIDENT’S CORNER**

As we close in (already) on the end of the fall semester, I take this opportunity to update you on happenings across SUNY and the activities of the University Faculty Senate.

We have entered the academic year with a host of opportunities and challenges, among them the search for a new Chancellor, leadership upheaval on campuses (SUNY Poly and ESF), and now the uncertainty around the election of a new President whose rhetoric has been divisive and whose policy initiatives regarding higher education are unclear.

So it is a time of change—for the country, for higher education, for SUNY. Let’s look more at some of those changes. Our student demographics are changing: more diversity, more “non-traditional” students who are older, part-time. As the number of high school graduates in upstate New York and many surrounding states declines, more of our campuses are expanding their recruitment efforts beyond their regional base, usually with the result of increasing the diversity of the student body. Importantly, our faculty diversity isn’t changing at the same pace, and many of our smaller communities are uncertain how to embrace these diverse students (and vice versa). Our teaching methodologies and approaches continue to change, sometimes in response to changing expectations of our students, sometimes in recognition of improvements that we can achieve in the classroom and/or virtual environments. And now our institutions are considering micro-credential, badges, stacking of credentials, and even initial forays into competency-based education.

Other challenges await. One possible fallout from the scandal that has brought down the leadership of SUNY Poly is increased State oversight of how SUNY does business. Perhaps this isn’t all bad, especially if it results in increased transparency of the operations of our campus foundations, and if it results in a refocus of SUNY onto its core academic mission.

A group of initiatives, both within SUNY and from without, have the potential to change (threaten, even) how we do business—the campus decisions on applied learning, the SUNY push for more online degrees and micro- and stackable credentials. It is not too apocryphal to assert that faculty control of curriculum could too easily be at risk. We need to assert and maintain control, just as we did when faced with an effort by the State to mandate experiential education of all students—a decision we, as faculty, need to control. Thus the UFS passed a pair of resolutions at our Fall Plenary meeting asserting faculty control over applied learning and future decisions on micro-credentials, competency-based education, other possible changes to our curricula. Yet we can’t simply hide within our traditions; instead, we need to strike a balance by willingness to adapt appropriately to internal and external demands and opportunities, while maintaining our essential role.

This was not a good year for support of SUNY in the State budget. Prospects for the upcoming year
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rather than replacing State dollars, and that the State should assume the "TAP gap"—the difference between maximum TAP awards and current SUNY tuition (note that, in effect, 25% of the tuition increases paid by other students have gone to paying the TAP gap).

Freedom of expression/academic freedom continues to come under attack in higher education, including pressures against a faculty member at SUNY Plattsburgh. CUNY is working on a policy in response to issues that occurred there last year, and the CUNY Faculty Senate endorsed the University of Chicago statement on freedom of expression. A UFS group is working on a stand for us to consider at the Winter Plenary.

We have a host of other UFS initiatives for the year, which are summarized in the reports of our committees that are part of the Fall Plenary report currently posted on the UFS website. I bring your attention in particular to an effort to seek non-voting positions for governance leaders on local college councils, analogous to our position on the SUNY Board of Trustees.

I also want to bring to your attention a number of upcoming events sponsored in part by the UFS. On March 7, SUNY Empire State will be hosting a graduate research symposium in Saratoga that will bring graduate students from across the System together to share results of their scholarship. A select group will travel to the Legislative Office Building in Albany to share the results of their research with legislators and staff, illustrating the benefits of the support that the State supplies to SUNY. This is an outgrowth of events that we have hosted for several years at the LOB, with poster presentations designed to showcase student research. The very limited attendance by legislators or staff, coupled with the logistical challenges of arranging an event at the LOB, convinced us to try something different, an approach that we believe will benefit our students more while at the same time allowing for advocacy with State legislators.

For the last 2 years, there has been a SUNY-wide undergraduate research conference (SURC), hosted in 2015 by SUNY Brockport and in 2016 by SUNY Cobleskill. Next spring there will be two SURC gatherings—SURC East at Suffolk County Community College on April 21, 2017, and SURC West at SUNY Fredonia on April 22, 2017. The intention of this pairing is to make it geographically easier for students to attend; the conferences are not intended to be restricted to community college or four-year colleges at the respective sites.

The third SUNY Voices Shared Governance conference will be held April 27-28 in Suffern, NY, on the topic of shared governance during times of leadership change. More details and a call for papers are posted on the SUNY Voices website.

SUNY has signed a contract to undertake the COACHE survey in January/February of 2017. This is a survey, overseen by the COACHE group at Harvard, that assesses the roles, responsibilities, and success of faculty. This is an important opportunity for campuses to learn what concerns the faculty, and ultimately to do something about it. Thus it is very important that faculty respond to the survey (even though it's lengthy). SUNY will be working with the COACHE group to provide analysis and recommendations to campuses to improve faculty success and satisfaction.

As you will see from the Chancellor’s report, the TeachNY initiative is her principal focus for this, her final year at SUNY. Accordingly, we discussed opportunities to improve teacher education as a primary the focus of the Fall Plenary meeting in Cortland. I am part of a steering committee that is reviewing the recommendations of the TeachNY Council (on which I also served) for policy recommendations to submit to the Board of Trustees. It is important to recognize that this initiative moves well beyond the schools of education, but calls upon the entire academic community (especially the "content" departments) to engage in the education of future teachers. TeachNY is also about elevating respect for the teaching profession, and enabling closer interactions between the K-12 sector and higher education.

The search for the next Chancellor of the State University of New York is well underway. I serve on the search committee in my dual role as President of the UFS and a member of the SUNY Board of Trustees; Nina Tamrowski, the President of the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, is the only other faculty member on the search committee. We are especially eager to ensure that the next Chancellor has extensive higher education experience, preferably as a college president or in a senior position in another system of public higher education. The search committee hopes to have a recommendation ready for consideration by the Board of Trustees sometime in the spring semester.

Some of what we do at the University Faculty Senate would seem to have little direct impact on your campus. But in fact our efforts on behalf of the faculty across SUNY are important—whether it be to engage in the political conversations on your behalf, to bring to your attention issues in higher education that impact us at SUNY, or to offer guidance to campus governance leaders. But most especially, we serve the interests of the faculty, to ensure that the faculty voice is heard in decision-making at the System level. I encourage you to get involved in governance on your campus and to consider joining one of our committees in the future if you are not already involved.
At SUNY, we’ve become fond of saying that teaching teachers is in our institutional DNA.

When SUNY was founded in 1948, eleven of the original colleges in the system were teachers colleges, many of which had histories that stretched back more than a century. Today SUNY prepares a quarter of the state’s teacher workforce and, remarkably, about 10 percent of the nation’s. Sixteen SUNY campuses have undergraduate and/or graduate programs leading to New York State certification for teachers and school leaders, and all 64 SUNY campuses contribute to the development of teaching and education in New York State.

New York is home to some of the best K-12 schools in the country, and while this is a point of pride and a benefit to select students, it is not enough. Mountains of literature tell us that excellent teaching is categorically the number one in-school factor that contributes to student success. Knowing this, it is incumbent upon us—we who teach the teachers who come to the campuses and programs in our system, ready to learn or not—to ensure that every student, from cradle to career, has access to excellent teaching. This is an economic as well as moral imperative. An educated citizenry is a more engaged citizenry—a healthier, wealthier populace full of people who are less likely to need to rely on public assistance, who have choices and options, who can support families, start businesses, take entrepreneurial risks, and work toward solving the world’s most serious challenges.

Through the TeachNY initiative, over the last two years SUNY has taken up the monumental challenge of transforming teacher preparation in New York State because it is necessary that we do so. TeachNY is a collaborative, multi-phased effort supported by a multi-million-dollar Race to the Top grant awarded to SUNY in 2012 by the New York State Education Department to advance the partnership between the two institutions. The expectation is that SUNY’s TeachNY policy framework will serve as a model for the state and the country.

TeachNY is being carried out in three phases. The first was a comprehensive report of findings and recommendations researched and drafted by the TeachNY Advisory Council, released in May 2016. The second phase is marked by full engagement of the vast SUNY system—campus and system leadership, governance, faculty, students—and its partners in translating the recommendations into proposed policy for action by the SUNY Board of Trustees. The third phase will be policy implementation (with targeted, strategic investment) and evaluation.

At the time of this writing we are approaching the end of Phase II of TeachNY. Since May, SED Commissioner MaryEllen Elia and I have traveled the state to attend more than twenty events—workshops, speak outs, listening sessions with SUNY presidents and faculty governance and leadership—through which we’ve gathered the most incisive input and information with which we can draft and implement practical policy that will put great teachers within reach of every student in New York State, no matter what zip code he or she lives in.

We invite you to learn more and continually track this all-important work at http://www.suny.edu/teachny/.

We have developed a broad definition of EESE for this purpose: “Ensuring that we deliver the educational programs that respond to the educational needs of the state and nation and the educational goals of every student.” We want to ensure, that as a System, we:

- Make determinations about where and how to grow enrollment in a purposeful way;
- Identify how best to meet the academic needs of the students arriving on our doorstep;
- Ensure that our increasingly diverse student body feels welcome, respected and supported;
- Strengthen completion programs and the infrastructures that support them; and
- Eliminate gaps in completion across student groups.

These are all areas that each campus addressed in their initial plans; however, in many cases, there was also a clear indication that due to a rapidly changing landscape there were challenges to overcome in meeting goals. After reading through all of the plans, our sense is that we would be better able to address the many changes higher education faces—in New York and nationally—by working together.

System Chief Financial Officer Eileen McLoughlin and I have been leading these meetings on behalf of Chancellor Zimpher, with a small group of our staff listening in to answer questions as needed. From the campuses, we have intentionally asked that they keep the number of attendees small but do ask that their local governance leader is included. Our motivation in limiting attendees was really the time constraints of trying to meet with all campuses over a twelve-week time period (our initial goal was six-weeks, and then we started the scheduling process . . .). The meetings are two-hours long and take place either on a
As we envisioned, there are common themes have emerged that really underscore the importance of this process. Not only issues where campuses can help one another, but also where System Administration can enhance its support:

- Re-establishing the enrollment/resource connection;
- Creating and/or modifying plans/policies/resource strategies that eliminate barriers to stronger performance;
- Eliminating the perceptions and reality of unwarranted internal enrollment competition;
- Leveraging our connectedness to better meet the needs of applicants on a regional and System-wide basis; and
- Facilitating conversations about mission creep/distinctiveness.

Also part of these conversations is discussion about the SUNY Performance Improvement Fund. We are encouraging campuses to submit competitive proposals for financial support that will help them achieve their goals.

This is a complex process and we are intentionally moving pretty quickly. When we have had the opportunity to meet with all campuses and review all of the information, we anticipate that we will be reaching back out to campuses to discuss regional opportunities and challenges.

In the end, as a result of these conversations, I believe we will have a System-wide Performance Improvement Plan for SUNY that allows us to serve more New Yorker better. Other key outcomes we are working to achieve include:

- Addressing the diverse needs of today's students;
- Achieving higher levels of quality, improving the reputation of individual campuses and the System;
- Reducing competition between our own campuses but position them to compete more effectively with non-SUNY Institutions;
- Addressing revenue challenges; and
- Positioning SUNY in the strongest possible light for State and Federal support.

As the System plan begins to take shape, we will definitely keep you up-to-date. I encourage you to send any thoughts or suggestions you may have related to the issues outlined here to your local campus governance leader.

Greetings,

As many of you know budget season is in full swing. For the Fall Faculty Senate Plenary Meeting, I summarized SUNY's operating and capital budget request that was sent to the Governor's office. After a series of State of the State addresses, in which the Governor visited and spoke at several SUNY campuses throughout the State, the Executive budget was released on January 17th.

The Executive Budget is one of the first steps in the budget process and provides a starting point for improvements and adjustments. SUNY will continue to advocate for our requested budget.

The most notable item in the Executive Budget is the Excelsior Scholarship. The Governor is proposing that full-time, resident, undergraduate students (taking 15 credits a semester), having a household income of less than $125,000, be eligible to receive free college tuition from any SUNY or CUNY institution. As a higher education institution, college affordability has always been the foremost topic, but now it is an important topic for government officials. Placing a spotlight on college affordability is a reflection of our advocacy for SUNY's Completion agenda and recognition of the 21st century job market.

Below is a summary of SUNY's budget request, the Executive Budget and its impact on SUNY.

Executive Budget Summary - Presented at Faculty Senate Winter Plenary
FROM THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES AND CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

2017/18 State University Funding Budget Request

Five-Year Extension of NY SUNY 2020
- "NY SUNY 2020: 1, 2, 3, 4"
- 2016/17: No increase to Resident Undergraduate Tuition
- 2017/18: No increase to Resident Tuition
- Tuition increase in minority districts
- Comps will request adjusting the undergraduate tuition rate at their campus (E.5, E.6, E.55, E.555)
- SUNY Board of Trustees action will review and modify tuition on the requested tuition adjustment

Increased and Sustained Direct Investment
- Reduction of future investments
- State sourcing of salary agreements
- Stable community college funding with investment
- Statutory campus requests as submitted
- Endowment/Programs for Hospitals
- Investment in effective programs and facilities
- Multi-Year Capital Budget investment

Multi-Year Capital Budget investment
- United Faculty support includes Educational Opportunity Centers (EOC), Advanced Technology Training, and Information Networking (ATIN), Island Business Development Centers (IBDC), Statutory Deferred Contributions (SDC) Program

Requested Year-to-Year Changes in Direct State Support (SM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2017/18 Requested State Budget</th>
<th>Investment in Student Success</th>
<th>Cost Avoidance</th>
<th>2017/18 SUNY Budget to Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State-operated campuses</td>
<td>$700.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$700.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>452.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>130.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-wide Programs</td>
<td>156.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>182.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Colleges</td>
<td>131.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>138.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals / Other Health</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Fund</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,166.4</td>
<td>$80.6</td>
<td>$6.0</td>
<td>$1,244.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This does not include prospective funding for state negotiated collective bargaining contracts.

2017/18 Capital Plan and Request Summary (SM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program**</th>
<th>2017/18 Request</th>
<th>5 Year Request</th>
<th>5 Year Plan Replacement</th>
<th>Appropriation Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Facilities</td>
<td>$800.0</td>
<td>$4,000.0</td>
<td>$3,200.0</td>
<td>Reimbursed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>600.0</td>
<td>600.0</td>
<td>600.0</td>
<td>Reimbursed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>405.5</td>
<td>405.5</td>
<td>50% State Share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Halls</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>200.0</td>
<td>Hard Dollar, Self-Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,483.5</td>
<td>$5,203.5</td>
<td>$3,201.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Request includes repayments totaling $5.8 billion in support of all five programs.
** The five-year requested amount will be reviewed annually to ensure sufficient funding in a pace to address essential capital needs.

2017/18 Executive Budget Year-to-Year Change in Direct State Tax Support: Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SM</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18 Request</th>
<th>2017/18 Executive</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D-E-A</th>
<th>E-C-A</th>
<th>F-C-A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State-operated Campus/ Systems Administration</td>
<td>$700.0</td>
<td>$700.0</td>
<td>$700.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Fund</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>500.3</td>
<td>500.3</td>
<td>477.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-wide Programs</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Colleges</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>145.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Activities</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,900.0</td>
<td>$1,902.0</td>
<td>$1,870.0</td>
<td>$30.0</td>
<td>$30.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:
- ** Includes indirect support and funding from other agencies.

The Money: Direct State Tax Support Breakdown

What Does This Mean?

State-operated Campuses
Maintenance of effort not included.

Investment Fund
- Baseline from 2016/17
- Shift from state-operated campus only
- Under administration, requesting for plan by the Board of Trustees

Statutory Colleges
- Maintenance in appropriation

Community Colleges
- SUNY Board of Trustees 2016/17
- Shift from state-operated campus only
- Under administration, requesting for plan by the Board of Trustees

University-wide Programs
- SUNY Board of Trustees 2016/17
- Shift from state-operated campus only
- Under administration, requesting for plan by the Board of Trustees

Hospitals
- SUNY Board of Trustees 2016/17

Other Items in the Executive Budget

Tuition Plan
- The Board of Trustees has approved an increase in tuition by a maximum of 2.5%. The Board of Trustees has authorized all institutions to increase tuition by up to 2.5% effective July 1, 2017.

Excellor Scholarship
- Programs to allow resident undergraduate students with a household income under the threshold to receive free tuition from SUNY or CUNY.

DREAM Act
- Programs for students without legal immigration status who have been injured in the war and are eligible for the TIP program and other scholarship programs.

Inspecter General
- Authorization of Inspector General to conduct investigations as necessary to ensure the appropriateness of the Executive Budget and the performance of the management of the Executive Budget.

Foundation Oversight
- Oversight of the Foundation to ensure adherence to the approved Executive Budget and the performance of the management of the Executive Budget.

Chief Procurement Officer
- Oversight of the Chief Procurement Officer to ensure adherence to the approved Executive Budget and the performance of the management of the Executive Budget.

Excelsior Scholarship Program

Governor Cuomo proposed a program in his Executive Budget called the Excelsior Scholarship Program. This program would allow resident undergraduate students with a household income of $125,000 or less to receive free tuition from SUNY or CUNY tuition-free. The program will be phased in over three years.

Fall 2017:
- Students with household incomes of $100,000 or less are eligible to receive free tuition from SUNY or CUNY.

Fall 2018:
- Students with household incomes of $110,000 or less are eligible to receive free tuition from SUNY or CUNY.

Fall 2019:
- Students with household incomes of $125,000 or less are eligible to receive free tuition from SUNY or CUNY.

Continued on page 6
News and updates

Johanna Duncan-Poitier
Senior Vice Chancellor for
Community Colleges and
the Education Pipeline

Greetings and thank you for this opportunity to share an update on the work underway in SUNY’s Office of Community Colleges and the Education Pipeline to support student success. We are very grateful for our partnership with the SUNY University Faculty Senate and for its leadership, scholarship, research and service across SUNY’s 64 campuses and in the State and the nation. Provided here are highlights of key initiatives we have been leading, in collaboration with faculty, students, K-12 educators, and industry partners to strengthen the education pipeline and help more students graduate from high school and college.

Scale-up of Major Completion Strategies

Like many of you, we are working to advance Chancellor Nancy Zimpher’s completion agenda to increase the number of students who enroll in SUNY and persist to earn college degrees and certificates. To do this, we are leading efforts to scale-up major completion strategies with demonstrated records of success for reducing barriers to college completion and helping students to stay on-track and graduate.

• Math Pathways: Major work is underway to scale-up the highly successful Quantway/Statway Math Pathways at SUNY, in partnership with the Carnegie Foundation Center for the Advancement of Teaching at Stanford University. Quantway/Statway courses present a new, evidence-based approach to developmental mathematics that has been shown to accelerate students’ progress through developmental mathematics with engaging, relevant concepts that students can use in their everyday lives. This year, we have doubled enrollment in the Quantway Pathway, growing to 12 campuses offering Quantway, and in the coming year, more than 29 campuses will be exploring or offering Quantway. More than 95 SUNY faculty and staff have participated and a projected 2,000 students will enroll in Quantway this year. This work has been made possible by a $3.3 million investment from The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and SUNY.

• Jobs for the Future (JFF) Student Success Center: In 2016, SUNY was named as one of five recipients to receive national designation as a “Jobs for the Future Student Success Center” with a $500,000 investment from The Kresge Foundation and The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. SUNY joins a thriving national network of JFF Student Success Centers, which provide vision, support, and a shared venue for a state’s community colleges to collectively advance access and completion. With this new designation, we have a unique opportunity to study strategies and initiatives with demonstrated evidence to impact student success and to share the knowledge we have gained with education leaders and policymakers across the State and the nation. SUNY’s leadership for the New York Student Success Center will enable us to continue to build capacity and scale-up highly effective evidence-based practices.

• Pathways in Technology Early College High Schools (P-TECH): SUNY colleges are partners in a statewide network of 33 P-TECHs. Resulting from a $21 million investment by New York Governor Andrew Cuomo, high schools, colleges, and businesses are working together to launch 9-14 P-TECH schools where students graduate from high school and earn an Associate’s degree, free of charge, at the end of six years. Graduating students are first in line for job opportunities in manufacturing, technology, and healthcare.

• Community College Community Schools: In 2016, Jefferson Community College, Mohawk Valley Community College, Rockland Community College, Adirondack Community College, and Onondaga Community College received awards to launch new community schools to provide critical wrap-around services to support student success. With the support of $1.5 million in State funding, community schools help to keep students on their paths to degrees by providing healthcare, child care, and other key student supports.
African American, 23 percent Caucasian, 15 percent Latino and Hispanic, and 8 percent Asian
• Students were engaged in hands on investigations using scientific tools
• An inquiry-based curriculum encouraged students to develop & test hypotheses and interpret & report results
• Results: increased/improved STEM content knowledge, attitudes toward STEM, interest in science, and self-efficacy as student scientists

**SUNY Graduate Student STEM Mentors**
• Increased confidence and skills in teaching practices, mentoring young people, transferring STEM knowledge and communication
• Following the mentoring experience, students reported interest in outreach, teaching, and working with young people in the future
• Added outreach and teacher experience to their CVs
• Strengthened commitment to scientific careers
• Repeat mentors contributed to the creation of new afterschool STEM curriculum

This year, the Army Education Outreach Program (AEP) selected SUNY, in collaboration with the Academy, as partners to expand student participation in enriching STEM exploration and learning, particularly for under-served students. In the year ahead, SUNY and the Academy will work together to scale-up AEP’s highly successful eCYBERMISSION initiative.

eCYBERMISSION is a web-based STEM competition for 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th grade students. Teams of 3-4 students work with Team Advisors to propose a solution to a real-world STEM-related problem in regional communities and compete for state, regional and national awards. We are encouraging students, faculty, coaches, and mentors are invited to join us in expanding student participation in STEM by volunteering to serve as an eCYBERMISSION Team Advisor, Virtual Judge, Cyberguide or Ambassador. More information is available at http://www.ecybernmission.com.

• Empire State STEM Learning Network: SUNY serves as the steward for the Empire State STEM Learning Network, a statewide collaborative of educators, business & industry partners, and government leaders in New York working to expand access to high-quality STEM teaching, increase the number of students in STEM disciplines who graduate prepared for 21st century careers, and communicate and advocate for STEM policies and programs. The Network is made up of 10 regional hubs that are aligned with the Regional Economic Development Councils. The Empire State STEM Network is a member of the Battelle Institute’s national STEMx Network. Empire State STEM Network leaders are working to provide teachers and students with high-quality, industry-based STEM programming. For example, this year:
  • Corning, Inc. hosted 250 teachers and educators in New York's Southern Tier at their Sullivan Park campus. Educators learned about careers in manufacturing.
  • The Western New York STEM hub (WNY STEM) hosted the annual “Celebrating STEM” recognition event at Roswell Park in Buffalo. The Buffalo Board of Education, Cattaraugus-Allegany Dream It! Do It! and Citi were recognized for their leadership to expand high quality STEM learning opportunities for students and teacher professional development. Also, WNY STEM, in collaboration with Siemens, awarded “Emerging School Systems” for demonstrating commitment to allocating resources, developing and establishing programs or priorities in STEM, as well as “Schools on the Move” for exemplary STEM initiatives and for progressing beyond the Emerging Level on the New York State STEM Quality Learning Rubric.
Senior Vice Chancellor… Continued from page 7

Workforce Development, Research and Job Training

SUNY is leading several important initiatives to help more students graduate prepared for 21st century workforce opportunities and to drive economic growth across New York State. Here are a few highlights.

• Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training (TAACCT): SUNY has trained nearly 5,000 students for competitive careers in manufacturing since the fall of 2012 with the $14.6 million TAACCT grant we were awarded from the U.S. Department of Labor. Through over 47 SUNY credit programs and numerous manufacturing targeted non-credit programs, all 30 SUNY community colleges have worked with over 300 businesses to revise, expand and enhance existing programs and build new programs including mechatronics, CNC machining, photovoltaics, plastics, optics and welding to address workforce needs in New York State.

• State Workforce Development: With $1.8 million in state support, SUNY community colleges have trained more than 16,000 employees from 275 in more than 100 types of training programs. These important training programs help more New York State employers create and retain jobs, increase productivity, and improve competitiveness.

For more information on these exciting initiatives, please contact the Office of Community Colleges and the Education Pipeline at (518) 320-1276.

FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE STUDENT ASSEMBLY

Marc Cohen
President, SUNY Student Assembly

SUNY Student Assembly continues to progress

There is no time to waste in the mission to improve SUNY. Every year where no progress is made on critical issues like affordability and creating more inclusive environments for our dynamically diverse student population, tens of thousands of people aren’t experiencing the best of what higher education can offer. Improving in these areas takes a major effort by students, the system’s largest group of stakeholders. The SUNY Student Assembly (SUNY SA) is working harder than ever before to make this positive impact potential a reality. At the same time, we know it is crucial to work with other stakeholders, most of all faculty, to move SUNY in the right direction.

The SUNY Student Assembly (SA) and the University Faculty Senate (UFS) have countless common interests to work on together. Perhaps more than any other is the need for greater state investment in SUNY. We recognized last year’s tuition freeze as a victory for students drowning in increasing debt, a financial challenge for our campuses seeking to continue educational improvement, and an opportunity for all of us to move forward with a new long-term plan that puts SUNY funding and student debt toward the top of the state’s priority list. SUNY SA’s Tuition Task Force has developed a policy framework that we look forward to advocating for throughout the year.

We want the state to increase funding enough to cover a cost freeze for students in the short term while maintaining educational quality, and implement a multi-year plan that makes SUNY debt-free for all students within five years.

Never before has radical funding increases for public higher education been so politically feasible, and we need to capitalize on the policy climate this year. We also recognize that we need sufficient revenue to cover cost increases on our campuses, including adequate staffing our academic programs with world-class faculty. Students benefit from stronger academic departments and faculty benefit from state investment through job security and opportunity. This is an issue that students and faculty must join together on in order to maximize our impact.

Student debt is approaching a crisis point, if it isn’t there already. SUNY SA’s single biggest priority on the issue of tuition and debt is to make college as affordable as possible and to minimize the debt that students suffer from post-graduation. It is an issue that goes beyond the needs of our higher education system and into broader society. Income inequality is becoming an increasing concern, and some higher education is usually necessary to earn a middle-class income. Education is an engine for improving our economy, our civics, and countless other tangential areas. Those with post-secondary education have better health outcomes, pay more in taxes, and are less likely to need support from government programs. The benefit of investing in higher education as a means toward improving society is as clear-cut as any policy debate. While our top priority is the debt burden for students, and that is our motivation to advocate for greater state investment, a differing set of priorities for faculty shouldn’t prevent us from finding common ground and making our call for investment in higher education louder.

Among many reasons we need a more affordable and accessible higher education system, one of the most important is to create a vehicle to uplift traditionally underserved communities. One of the issues that students are most passionate about are those of diversity, equity, and inclusion. We have strong leadership in the SUNY SA committee devoted to these issues that is intent on tackling a wide range of issues from racial bias to disability accommodations. Incidents throughout the country in recent years have brought light to the challenges that minority populations face in our society, and SUNY SA is excited to contribute to progress in this arena.

We were recently recognized for spearheading the efforts that led to SUNY adopting a “Ban the Box” policy. Our public systems of higher education should always stand firmly on the side of accessibility and nondiscrimination, a principle that student leaders throughout the state acted on when a resolution in favor of banning the box was passed at the SUNY SA Spring 2016 conference. We were thrilled to see the SUNY Board of Trustees adopt this policy and will continue to bring forward initiatives on the forefront of creating an inclusive environment. New York is lucky to have an incredibly diverse population, and SUNY’s student body reflects that. Students understand that the ability to respect and work
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with others from various backgrounds is critical in the 21st century, and SUNY has an opportunity to position itself as a standard-bearer in the higher education landscape by embracing policy initiatives that provide students of every identity with an educational environment that supports them.

When it comes to issues like affordability and diversity, students are incredibly passionate and active. SUNY SA is proud of student efforts throughout the state to make positive change, and joins them in their urgency. Student leaders typically don't have very long to push for reforms, especially in a higher education environment of complex policies and a norm of multi-year incremental change. I know my time is limited as the President of SUNY SA and a member of the SUNY Board of Trustees, as it is for my SUNY SA leadership team, all of the student government presidents, and every other student trying to make a difference in their community before graduating. It is truly an incredible and humbling opportunity to have a seat at the table for students. I am so personally grateful to work with so many administrative and faculty leaders in our system and am often encouraged by their commitment to student input and their shared values.

One faculty leader in particular that is a staunch ally to student participation in shared governance is UFS President, Pete Kuepfer. Like I know I am always trying to reflect the values of students, I know that Pete's openness to students is a reflection of the values of UFS and faculty throughout our system more broadly. For this reason, I am confident that SUNY SA and UFS will continue to be close partners in building a culture of collaborative shared governance for years to come, far after the tenure of the leaders of either organization.

At the same time, this unique year of leadership transitions in our system and beyond provides an opportunity to act more urgently than ever - to take leaps forward instead of steps. Changes in leadership are happening from my home campus (University at Albany, to replacing Nancy Zimpher as SUNY Chancellor, to the President of UFS, and all the way to the President of the United States. We have an opportunity to leverage this dynamic environment of change to propose bolder solutions than ever before to the problems that we grapple with year after year.

The fact that UFS gives the SUNY SA President this opportunity to provide our perspective on the upcoming year to your membership is evidence of its eager support of the student voice. Similarly, SUNY SA always advises student activists throughout the system to engage faculty, administration, and other stakeholders when pursuing a policy initiative. Students and faculty alike are bonded by their commitment to improving our higher education institutions. This year I am committed to strengthening our partnerships, working together on the issues that benefit all of us, and making progress on things that matter.

Norman Goodman
Stony Brook University

[Editor's note: Information about possible policies of a Trump administration—his speeches, statements by him and his staff, his tweets, his proposed appointments to his administration—keeps emerging at a dizzying pace. Consequently, it is important to note that the material in this column takes into account information available up to December 7, 2016.]

President-elect Trump and public higher education

Much of the country, if not the world, is still reeling from the shock waves of the 2016 election for president of the United States. There is considerable concern that the election of Donald Trump as president of the United States will result in a retreat to “Fortress America,” an undoing of international treaties and alliances, an international trade war, a foreign policy that is entangled with President Trump’s business interests, a more militaristic approach to international problems, an unwise and unnecessary polarization between Western and Muslim culture, an exacerbation of income inequality in the U.S. despite campaign statements, and a coarsening of the rhetoric and actions toward minority groups, among other issues. While the potential impact of Trump’s election on public higher education is still unclear, it’s possible to foresee a range of credibly negative consequences.

An examination of Trump’s website shows that of all the topics on which he had taken a position during the campaign (i.e., infrastructure, cybersecurity, veterans affairs reform, trade, tax plan, regulations, national defense, immigration, health care, foreign policy and defeating ISIS, energy, K-12 education, Constitution and Second Amendment, child care, and economy), there is nothing specific to higher education. Consequently, what public higher education can expect from a Trump administration can only be gleaned by elements of the Republican Party Platform, comments in speeches he has given during and since the campaign, his proposed appointments to key administrative positions, and statements by the national co-chair and policy director of his campaign, Sam Clovis. For the most part, these bits and pieces of information have roiled the waters of higher education. What then may we surmise about a Trump administration’s policies for public higher education?

Though not directly involving public higher education, some of the likely economic policies of the Trump administration will clearly affect it. From what we know so far, he has proposed the standard Republican preference for “trickle-down economics.” Though he claims he will cut taxes across the board, the greatest benefits will go to the wealthy, which Trump says will provide resources to “job creators” to create more jobs. History, however, suggests that this is a false equation. Tax reductions for the wealthy have not generally resulted in creating jobs, but have been used more frequently to invest or save those funds rather than spending them to create more demand and, therefore, more jobs. Thus, it would do little to provide more income for families, which could be used in part to...
provide for a college education for their children—especially important in an era of diminishing financing for public higher education from the states. In addition, Trump's announced intention to slap higher tariffs on imports from China (a major trading partner) and other countries could not only start a trade war with disastrous world-wide economic consequences, but also increase the cost of imported goods for Americans that would, consequently, reduce family buying power, including funds available for their children's college education.

The Trump Administration's spending plans have focused on increasing funding for defense and reducing "discretionary" funding—essentially, those funds available to meet domestic needs. Coupled with Trump's generally anti-science stance, these spending plans are likely to result in reduced federal funding for basic and applied research to assist in establishing and assessing public policy, much of which is carried out in colleges and universities.

Trump's strong anti-immigrant position and his intention to reverse President Obama's executive action in creating DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals) will reduce the attractiveness and competitiveness of U.S. colleges and universities for international students and faculty. This will have the effect of reducing the kind of diversity in both students and staff that enhances the quality of education and that expands our students' intellectual horizons. It will also affect our global influence in an increasingly connected world, by reducing our ability to educate the future leaders of countries around the world who will understand—and, hopefully appreciate—our policies, perspectives, and values. There have been reports that this oft-stated position of President-elect Trump—and his designated National Security Advisor, Michael Flynn, designated Attorney General Jeff Sessions, and Senior Political Advisor, Stephen Bannon—has already created considerable anxiety on college campuses, which has seriously affected the academic performance of some of our students. Similarly, the bigotry and hate rhetoric that marked the election campaign has been picked up and amplified in recent weeks and led to widespread concern among Muslims, Hispanics, and other minorities in the country and on our campuses about their safety, security, and well-being.

A more direct effect on public higher education of a Trump administration can also be gleaned from some of the sources indicated earlier, which indicate support for the following policies and preferences:

- A relaxation of regulations governing for-profit colleges and universities, which have, in general, been found to provide an inferior education and false promises of jobs after graduation. There also appears to be an intent to reverse the current administration's plan to discharge the loans of those students who have been defrauded by these institutions, which would seem to add insult to injury for these students.
- Reinforcement of the growing emphasis among Republican governors and legislators to view public higher education solely through the lens of providing job skills rather than also providing for an educated and thoughtful citizenry necessary to a civic society.
- An anti-science mentality evident during the campaign (e.g., denial of the scientific consensus on humans' contribution to global warming and its likely effects), which undermines the intellectual enterprise of higher education and justifies seeing it as a jobs training program.
- Determination to defeat any proposals to provide for a debt-free and tuition-free public higher education at a time when the debt burden of our students is clearly a drag on their future. However, Trump did vow to force colleges to cut tuition by controlling costs and using their endowments for this purpose, though he is apparently unaware of the fact that a substantial part of endowments is restricted in how it can be used.
- An effort to move the governments out of the business of providing student loans and restore that role to private banks, which would inevitably increase the cost of the loans.
- Making it more difficult for students majoring in the liberal arts (primarily in the Humanities, Fine /Performing Arts, and most of the Social and Behavioral Sciences) at non-elite universities to get student loans because of doubts about their future earning potential. This would lead to an unwarranted government interference in what should be a free choice on the part of students in light of their future goals.
- Providing a taxpayer subsidy for low-income students, though there has been no specific plan put forward for such a program or how it would be paid for—especially when the proposed tax cuts and spending increases for the military will reduce the available federal funds for domestic programs, including this one.
- Allowing a wider range of accrediting bodies that could offer the opportunity to weaker institutions to "cherry pick" less rigorous ones. There is also some stated intention to remove accreditation as a requirement for federal funding—something that would eliminate an effective lever to assess the quality of an institution as a justification of federal funding.
- Limiting enforcement of Title IX regarding sex discrimination, especially with respect to sexual assault and bias toward sexual orientation, essentially rolling back the clock to a time of unprotected predatory relationships.
- The proposed appointment of Representative Tom Price as Secretary of Health and Human Services. Representative Price has long been an ardent foe of the Affordable Care Act and, in his role in the House of Representatives, has proposed legislation in the past to overturn the ACA, including a provision to allow youth to stay on their parents' health insurance until the age of 26—an obvious benefit to our students.
- The appointment of Betsy DeVos, an ardent foe of public education and sponsor of charter schools and school choice, whose views may well carry over to her policies with regard to public higher education.

To sum up, these presumed policies of a Trump administration would, in my view, have a distinctly negative effect on the quality of and access to public higher education. Whether they will actually be put into effect is still an open question. President-elect Trump's post-election softening of some of his earlier positions (note the reports of his meeting with the reporters and columnists of The New York Times after his election) suggest some possible reprieve from the worst of these. However, his recent proposed appointments to his administration suggest just the opposite. There is a well-known ancient Chinese curse that may be apocryphal that says "May you live in interesting times." We certainly do!
Potsdam College

The Potsdam Bicentennial: Celebrating two centuries of creativity and innovation in higher education
Walter J. Conley
SUNY Potsdam

Few argue Harvard University’s claim, dating to a charter with the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1636, as the oldest institution of higher learning in the United States. The first institution of higher learning within the State of New York was chartered as King’s College by King George II of England in 1754. The College ceased operations during the American Revolutionary War, reforming after the war as Columbia College. A few decades later, closer to Canada than any neighboring state, was the formation of the institution that would become the oldest within the State University of New York, St. Lawrence Academy.

The genesis of state university systems can be traced to our southern states with the first chartered system created in 1785 by an act of the General Assembly of Georgia. State university systems expanded rapidly during the middle 19th century under the Morrill Land-Grant Colleges Acts of 1862 and 1890. The State University of New York (SUNY), the largest university system in the country, was established in 1948 by Governor Thomas E. Dewey on the foundation of the public normal schools established in the 19th century. Initially including 29 institutions of higher education, the system has expanded to include 64 universities and colleges. Within the original cluster is one of the oldest institutions of higher education in the nation, the State University of New York College at Potsdam (SUNY Potsdam), currently celebrating its bicentennial year. SUNY Potsdam traces its origin to St. Lawrence Academy.

Residents of Potsdam petitioned the New York State Board of Regents to establish the Academy in December of 1812, but battles along the St. Lawrence River during the War of 1812 diverted attention to other immediate needs. In 1816, just a decade after the founding of the town, local residents convinced the legislature to revisit their proposal and the Academy was created with the signing of a charter on 25 March 1816, opening its doors to students in September of the same year.

Founded by Benjamin Raymond, surveyor for the Clarkson family, the Academy grew rapidly. The first class of 42 students increased to 144 by 1820, attracting students from as far as Oneida and Clinton counties and many towns throughout southern Canada. A second building was added in 1825 to accommodate growth. Most early institutions of higher learning in the United States were created to train ministers. In contrast, St. Lawrence Academy had an early focus on the preparation of public school teachers. In 1828 Reverend Asa Brainerd became the preceptor of the developing college and was recognized for the introduction of a creative and innovative teacher education program. The curriculum was the first systematic attempt to focus on the preparation of public school teachers in the United States.

In 1835 the New York State Legislature acted to establish stronger programs for public school teacher preparation and designated one academy in each senatorial district to receive money for a special teacher-training department. St. Lawrence Academy received this distinction, building upon innovative programs in the preparation of teachers. On 7 May 1844, the State Legislature voted to establish a New York State Normal School in Albany, now the University of Albany, as the first college for teacher education. As need increased a second normal school was established during 1861 in Oswego, now SUNY Oswego. The Village of Potsdam was selected as a site of a normal school in 1867.

In 1884 Julia Etta Crane, a graduate of the Potsdam Normal School, became leader of the music department. Under her direction, and continuing our history of creativity and innovation, the School developed the first normal training curriculum for public music teachers in the United States. Approximately half of the music teachers in New York State are graduates of the Crane School of Music. Other innovations included the founding of the Crane Chorus in 1931 by Helen M. Hosmer, and The Crane Symphony Orchestra in 1939 as the second college orchestra in the country, following Harvard University. The Crane School of Music has an international reputation for excellence.

Whereas SUNY Potsdam is recognized for innovation and creativity in our teacher preparation and arts programs, we also excel in the STEM disciplines and have the second highest proportion of students electing STEM education within our sector. For example, Clarence Stephens started his career as a research mathematician but became more interested in mathematics education. Dr. Stephens joined the Potsdam Faculty as Chair of Mathematics in 1969, introducing his creative and innovative techniques in mathematics instruction. During his tenure, SUNY Potsdam had the third largest number of mathematics majors of any college in the country, graduating mathematics majors at more than 20 times the national average. Many graduates continued their education earning doctoral degrees in mathematics. This feat is often referred to as the “Potsdam Miracle.”

Our bicentennial celebration included a year of special lectures, concerts, student projects, and the completions of a highly successful comprehensive campaign. The Take the Lead Campaign exceeded its goal by several million dollars and will support scholarships and programs at SUNY Potsdam. In honor of the SUNY Potsdam bicentennial, the New York State Senate and Assembly passed special resolutions in March 2016, and Congresswoman Elise Stefanik read a commemoration on the College’s history into the official record on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

On the 200th anniversary of the College’s founding, 25 March 2016, SUNY Potsdam held a bicentennial bash for the campus community and invited dignitaries from other campuses in the SUNY system and the region. In attendance were guests
from SUNY System Administration, SUNY Canton, SUNY Cortland, SUNY Brockport, Clarkson University, and St. Lawrence University; alongside hundreds of students, faculty, staff, and alumni.

As we move into our third century we strive to build upon our rich history. Challenged by diminishing state support, we look to efficiencies and the generosity of our alumni to continue to enhance rich learning experiences for our students. With the bicentennial serving as a catalyst for reflection and change, four centers were created or enhanced this year to better serve students and faculty.

A combination of campus resources and a generous donation from President Esterberg resulted in the renovation and expansion of our Center for Diversity. The center provides a number of resources to our increasingly diverse campus community. Resources include academic support, social programs and services, diversity training, skill development workshops, and leadership opportunities.

Also as part of our bicentennial celebrations, and continued creativity and innovation in STEM disciplines, the Wagner Institute for Sustainability and Ecological Research (WISER) was opened in a newly constructed space within our science complex. Made possible by a generous gift from Wendy and Robert Wagner, the institute will facilitate opportunities for student-faculty collaborative research focusing on issues of environmental sustainability and conservation.

The Center for Creative Instruction was created from a blend of existing offices and committees to strengthen, enhance, and support teaching and learning. This faculty resource was created in a renovated space within our Crumb Library, in the middle of our academic quad, and developed from a recommendation of our Faculty Senate. Also housed in renovated space in our Crumb Library is the new Center for Applied Learning. Created with Performance Improvement Funds and a generous donation from Joy and Richard Dorf, the center is a first within SUNY and seeks to create greater opportunities for student-faculty collaborations in transformative learning experiences. Thus, with a renewed spirit, and a continued focus on providing a high quality liberal arts education for our students, we are ready for our third century.

Program and Awards Committee

Beyond Lake Wobegon – Rewarding the More than Above Average

Bruce Leslie
College at Brockport

Programs and Awards is the least important — and the most important — University Faculty Senate Committee. While other committees discuss weighty issues of ethics, governance, research, and student life, we spend our time debating the intricacies of the criteria for SUNY’s Programs and Awards. But on the other hand, our work yields direct results with most of our recommendations operationalized by the Provost.

Much of the work is mundane tinkering, but we have the delightful task of helping reward our colleagues’ expertise and hard work with at least psychic, and sometimes remunerative, rewards. Toward that end, the Programs and Awards Committee has three tasks. “Our” Program is Conversations in the Disciplines. “Our” Awards are the Chancellor’s Awards and the Distinguished Professorships. Distinguished Professorships To start with the last, the Distinguished Professorships began in 1963, just as SUNY was taking off with a shove from Governor Nelson Rockefeller. Over 1000 have been created in the succeeding 60+ years in four fields: Distinguished [i.e., Scholarship & Creative Activity] Professors (371); Distinguished Service Professors (310); Distinguished Teaching Professors (376); and Distinguished Librarians (5). Five Distinguished Librarians?!

Clearly there is a problem. And this is the year to deal with problems with Distinguished Professors. The Policies and Procedures for Distinguished Professorships and for Chancellor’s Awards operate on alternating two year cycles. This year we are reviewing Distinguished Professorships to write the rules for the 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 academic years. When I say ‘write the rules’, we are officially only advisory to the Provost — but virtually all of our editorial suggestions and all of our resolutions have been accepted in recent years.

The Policies and Procedures have, in our opinion, become too complicated and we are attempting to prune and clarify them. We have strengthened the language requiring that the grading practices of candidates for the Distinguished Teaching Professor be included in the nomination package and that inconsistent patterns be explained.

Overall, the policies for the three Distinguished Professor categories have served well and there is no ground swell for reform. However, we face the challenge of making the Distinguished Librarianship more accessible while maintaining high standards. Some problems are above our pay grade — some of the most likely candidates are ineligible due to holding administrative positions. And there are fewer ‘full’ librarians than we would expect. But we can normalize what seems to be excessive expectations in language that must deter candidates. And we plan to widen the range of activities that can contribute to a successful nomination. Two librarians on the committee are working on the revisions and will take our proposals to the SUNY librarians’ organization. Watch for a preliminary report at the Winter Plenary and a resolution at the Spring Plenary.

The revised Policies and Procedures for all four Distinguished Professorship categories should be sent to the campuses next July.

Although officially Distinguished Professorships are designated by the Board of Trustees, our recommendations have been routinely approved. And they should be, as not only do candidates have to gain approval from their campus’ selection committee and President, but they are then scrutinized by a SUNY Advisory Council composed of Distinguished Professorships in each category. From sitting on the Distinguished Service Professor Advisory Council, I can vouch for their rigor. Before my first meeting I had assumed a candidate was a slam dunk — wrong! My colleagues picked the nomination apart before grudgingly accepting it. And a number of nominations are rejected, especially by the Advisory Council for the full Distinguished Professor.

Successful nominees receive their awards at a delightful awards dinner sponsored by SUNY. After dining each new Distinguished Professor is individually introduced and the Chancellor hangs the medal (and they are heavy) around each new Distinguished Professor’s neck and a ‘photo op’ records your elevation for posterity. No event more fully exudes a sense of systemness recognizing SUNY’s most important work. It wasn’t always a classy event; one former Chancellor told the awardees to come up and collect their ‘bling’!

Chancellor Zimpher has raised the Distinguished Professorships to a new level by establishing the Distinguished Academy five years ago. Her hope has been to generate synergy among some of the system’s ‘best and brightest’. The Academy meets in the afternoon before the annual awards dinner for discussions of timely issues and to plan projects. But to date the Academy has not fully reached its potential. In the hopes of solidifying the Academy before Chancellor Zimpher retires, the Provost’s Office has seconded Janet Nepke for the year to galvanize us plan our future. By the May 2017 awards dinner we hope to have

SPOTLIGHT
formulated proposals that will give the Academy clearer direction and purpose.

The UFS Programs & Awards Committee hard at work

Chancellor’s Awards

The other half of ‘Awards’; and one that affects many more faculty, is the Chancellor’s Awards. Faculty and Staff are eligible for eight different Awards. Four echo the Distinguished Professors categories; they are the Chancellor’s Awards for Librarianship, for Scholarly and Creative Activity, for Service; and for Teaching. In addition, there are Chancellor’s Awards for Adjunct Teaching, for Classified Service, and for Professional Service. We play a major in the first of those, but little role in the latter two. Finally, there is the Chancellor’s Award for Shared Governance.

Last year our work centered on revising the Policies and Procedures for Chancellor’s Awards for the academic years 2016/2017 and 2017/2018. The Committee felt that the rules were too complicated and sometimes ambiguous. Thus, working with Vice-Chancellor Lane, we streamlined and clarified the Policies and Procedures that went to campuses last July. We hope these changes facilitate more nominations.

More fundamentally, the Committee felt that changes in higher education had enlarged two categories of faculty who were ineligible for Chancellors Awards; they were full-time non-tenure track faculty and clinical faculty at the health related campuses. As a result, we presented two resolutions to the University Faculty Senate last April. One made clinical faculty eligible for the Chancellor’s Awards in Scholarship & Creative Activities and in Service; they were already eligible for the Teaching Award. The second resolution addressed the growing number of full-time faculty who are not on a tenure track. Many serve SUNY for long periods of time and add needed expertise to campus’ teaching bullpen. Both resolutions passed unanimously and the expansion of categories was written into the Policies and Procedures that were sent to campuses last July.

The Chancellor’s Award for Shared Governance is a special case. It was created by the University Faculty Senate, but is administered by same procedures of the Provost’s Office as for the other Chancellor’s Awards. This should be reviewed by next year’s committee when the Policies and Procedures are up for review. We have attracted too few nominations and perhaps the number would be augmented if the UFS felt more sense of ownership — though that would also mean more work. But there is anomaly that the committee which judges the applications is appointed by the Provost without input from the Programs and Awards Committee.

I regret not becoming cognizant of this sooner. It is important that we recognize and reward good practice and encourage campus administrations that practice shared governance. My hope is that we will be able to increase nominations sufficiently to award more than one per year out of 64 campuses. With more nominations then it would become possible to have separate awards for ‘state ops’ and for community colleges. An Honorable Mention category is another possibility for increasing the Award’s impact. Our Committee has so far ignored the only partially facetious calls for an award to shame unshared governance. But who knows!

Conversations in the Disciplines

The first task presented to me as Chair was to consider major changes in this long-standing program. I was supposed to measure the program’s efficacy over its c.50-year history as a base for examination. That has proved to be a tougher job than expected. To this day I cannot lay my hands on the records (and for an historian that is especially frustrating). The SUNY administrator who was supposed to have the records and work with me was AWOL in the six months before her retirement. Frequent staff changes and personnel shortages in the Provost’s Office have meant some continued frustrations. On the other hand, we’ve had excellent clerical support from Yvette Roberts.

We have considered the whole range of options. We discussed recommending the termination of the program — so much work goes into delivering a mere $40,000 in $5000 grants. On the other hand, this small amount of seed money yields a surprisingly bountiful intellectual yield. So we decided against the nuclear option. A related question was the size of the awards. We decided that while there were attractions in creating different levels of grants, without considerably increased funding it was neither feasible nor wise.

Another issue was the nearly half-century ban on funding pedagogically oriented proposals. Apparently from the earliest Conversations in the Disciplines in the late 1960s, the policy was that the Conversations focus “on scholarly and creative development rather than administrative, curricular, or instructional matters designed to foster both professional and personal growth of participants and their respective campuses.” That was clearly crafted when SUNY was evolving from a core of former State Teachers Colleges into multi-purpose institutions. But given that that evolution had occurred decades ago, this prohibition seemed excessive and barred fruitful Conversations that include consideration of the instructional implications of scholarly developments. Thus, the Programs and Awards Committee proposed the following resolution which was unanimously adopted at the Fall, 2016 Plenary and this revision will be in the guidelines for proposals for Conversations in the 2017/2018 academic year.

Resolved that the University Faculty Senate recommends the current language describing criteria for Conversations in the Disciplines awards be amended to read: “SUNY CID focuses on scholarship, creative activities, and new developments in academic disciplines and fields. Conversations may also include examination of related curricular innovations. Proposals that include discussion of instructional matters must have participation by the appropriate disciplinary departments.”

In addition, we have received complaints that the proposal guidelines for Conversations in the Disciplines are needlessly complicated for such a small grant. We are trying to shorten and clarify the instructions that will be distributed in December or early January. We expect that the Provost will approve our recommendations.

Conclusion

Thus we have two main tasks for the remainder of the year. The first is fine-tuning the Distinguished Professor Policies and Procedures, especially for Librarianship. The second is to oversee the final form of the guidelines for Conversations in the Disciplines and then to judge the resulting proposals that will be forwarded to Provost Cartwright.

While Programs and Awards is a committee of the ‘State Ops,’ we work closely with the Awards Committee of the Faculty Council of the Community Colleges. Its Chair, Iris Cook, participates in our meetings and works as an extraordinary liaison between our two bodies. As a result, our UFS committee effectively, though unofficially, speaks for all SUNY campuses.

I am completing my third (term-limited) year as Chair of the Programs and Awards Committee. I have been blessed with supportive committee members, especially this year. And having a SUNY Provost who understands shared governance has meant that our work feels meaningful.

Finally, for many of us academe is a calling in which psychic rewards and intelligent collegueshship make our worlds go round. I hope my Committee’s work has helped faculty and staff feel that their extra efforts are appreciated. I further hope that these SUNYwide awards augment our sense of systemness — our sense that our work has meaning across and beyond our campuses to the entire system.
The efferent and the aesthetic: Acquiring meaning by decoding messages

Joe Marren
SUNY Buffalo State

The writing that we do as academics is meant to be scholarly and informative. No surprise there, eh? So we write very serious reports about what goes on at plenaries for the constituents at our home campuses, or we fashion oh-so-serious-and-dire pleas to deans and provosts citing stats sans anecdotes for more faculty lines. But in all cases there is plenty of time and room to let our unique voices sing through. We are efferent but we want to be aesthetic. This essay says we can be both.

What’s an essay without an anecdote? Here’s mine: When I was a sportswriter covering the state track and field championships in the mid-1980s there was a runner from Western New York who ran in two (maybe three?) races but won one event. When I wrote the story about the championship day I wrote something like “Joe Soandso only won the 100 hurdles.” What I meant was that his sole win was in a certain race; his father, though, wrote me a very nasty letter saying that my use of “only” implied his son failed because I wrote that said progeny didn’t win any of the other races. It was not my intent to cast blame or to ridicule the young man, rather it was my job to say what he won and what he didn’t win. So we can obviously get into trouble with the words we use even when we don’t mean to cause trouble. As Robert Frost wrote: “We make ourselves a place apart Behind light words that ease and flout, But oh, the agitated heart Till someone find us really out. “Tis pity if the case require (Or so we say) that in the end We speak the literal to inspire The understanding of a friend. “But so with all, from babes that play At hide-and-seek to God afar, So all who hide too well away Must speak and tell us where they are.”

Revelation
How do we acquire meaning when words can be confusing? Since we use words to tease and flout it seems natural that we should begin with understanding a little something about words and word usage. For example, silly in Old English meant blessed, or touched by the spirit of the Lord. When people are touched by the spirit of an omniscient being they are probably enraptured and they may act differently than the rest of us. Over time that inner spiritual revelation came to be redefined and understood as the way people outwardly behaved and so it morphed into our understanding of the word silly as used today.

English language beginnings varies between ye Olde English Northumbrian dialect and the Saxon dialect with various subdialects thrown in. The story of “Caedmon’s Hymn” illustrates that. There’s a shepherd who can’t tell stories at night round the fire with the other shepherds. So he always leaves when it’s story time. But one day an angel (not an Angle) finds him in the stable and commands him to tell a story. Caedmon says he can’t, and he doesn’t know any stories anyway. So the angel tells him to speak of beginnings — of creation. (“Caedmon, sing me frumseaf.”) In other words, the efferent language is the simple building block of aesthetic language.

We acquire meaning (understanding) through the words we choose to use. But words are fickle. Ludwig Wittgenstein said our minds are not boxes that only we have access to, and that to acquire meaning there must be social conventions and practices subject to empirical methodology. The definitions we acquire for ourselves are not inherent (e.g. Joe Marren, professor, Buffalo State, journalist, newspapers, etc.). As Wittgenstein wrote, “The limits of my language are the limits of my world.”

What we do when we communicate is bring words back from the metaphysical to their everyday use. That can be seen with some of Noam Chomsky’s writings. Chomsky’s theory on transformative generative grammar posits that all humans have the ability and desire to communicate (deep structure) and that grammar is transformed (generated) into surface structures of a language by a set of rules, although the surface rules are nuanced from language to language. In other words, Chomsky would say everyone has the ability to articulate thoughts and that codified language orders those thoughts to help us communicate. Therefore, we do not learn a language but rather acquire it through careful, repetitive attention to competencies since we already innately possess the ability for language. In other words, we are born efferent and acquire aesthetics as we continue to write. Thus, writing is recursive because in order to “perform” its mission (to provide meaning) it uses the signs (words) arranged in a syntactic pattern to form an acknowledged (“competent”) meaning.

To do the job we can produce an infinite number of words. If we couldn’t then we would eventually reach the end of language. But since we are constantly thinking of new things to say (deep structure) we need to make and then understand an infinite number of sentences. Therefore, language plays a role in deep patterns of human thought that transcend the boundaries of culture and time.

This is where aesthetics comes in because communication is creative. To illustrate my point, I’m turning to Thomas Merton, a Trappist monk and essayist, and his poem And the Children of Birmingham because it speaks to me on several personal levels. The level I want to focus on for this essay is that reading it reminds me of my former job as a reporter. In the poem Merton sets the stage and lets us interpret the action (acquire meaning).

Merton’s life and his writings were about love and the redemptive power of forgiveness. We must understand Merton’s theory of poetry and what he is trying to accomplish. To do that we must examine his voice, which is where journalism comes in. Biographers say that Merton, from his peaceful monastery in rural Kentucky, stormed against societal ills that were evil. He lists such things as a reporter would in And the Children of Birmingham. This detached, matter–of–fact tone uses imagery, sometimes playfully, to become reportage.

And the children of Birmingham
Walked into the story
Of Grandma’s pointed teeth
(“Better to love you with”)
As someone who has written and edited thousands of news stories I
can say that what Merton offers is almost a classic journalistic lede because it says who (the children of Birmingham) and what they did (walked into the fury). The fact that it also alludes to a classic children's story reiterates that it is about children and what they did.

Several years ago I met a woman in Selma who was a teen-ager during the civil rights demonstrations there. She protested, was arrested, bailed out and then went to protest again. She was arrested again and bailed out again. Repeat that same scene several times and it becomes the aesthetic chronicle born from the efferent facts. It wasn't until the young people of Selma were arrested time after time that the Black middle class of teachers, professionals and others joined the protests.

But what the children did that time
Gave their town
A name to be remembered!
(And tales were told
Of man's best friends, the Law.)

How do we tell our own stories? The story that Merton tells is the story of how people protested and changes (too slowly) came. His comment was that despite the violence inflicted by police, change was inevitable.

The Trappists are a contemplative order and yet Merton's idea of contemplation was to be "of the world, but not in the world." So he couldn't help but comment on issues he felt were important, whether about a nuclear arms race that would doom the world, or of a struggle for basic human dignity on the city streets. In And the Children of Birmingham this comes out:

And the children of Birmingham
Walked in the shadow
Of Grandma's devil
Smack up against
The singing wall.

Fire and water
Poured over everyone:
"Hymns were extreme,
So there could be no pardon!"
The idea of contemplation touches on Merton's evolving creativity. When he wrote the poem in 1968 he was no longer the younger monk who wrote The Seven Storey Mountain. He had grown and changed, so it was probably natural for him to seek new ways to express himself. Merton was discovering and re-evaluating things and some critics suggest that he was coming to believe that just as there is flexibility in life, there must be flexibility in art and in letting an audience interpret/acquire meaning. So we can interpret this poem in many ways, but the title and the reportorial word images he wrote lead us along a path I believe Merton wanted us to take. I think the poem is a way of interpreting and commenting on spiritual life, or maybe it's what the poet (and Jesuit priest) Gerald Manley Hopkins would call an inscape. In other words, there is spiritual and artistic growth, though they are not necessarily developing at complementary rates.

Based on Merton's life as a contemplative I imagine he wants us to think deeper about messages and meanings, about the efferent and the aesthetic in our own writing. There be dragons sailing into such uncharted waters, but the joy is in the voyage as we meet other travelers.

TeachNY: A primer and call to action
Dennis Showers
SUNY Geneseo

TeachNY is a new initiative on the part of SUNY to respond to the looming teacher shortage in a way that addresses new challenges to schools and teachers in the second decade of the 21st century. It takes a new and deeper look into the preparation, diversity, impact, and development of the next generation of teachers. As the University Faculty Senate is the shared governance mechanism for the state-operated institutions of SUNY, this initiative should serve as a tool to engage people on every campus in a conversation of how to bring the entire university into the preparation of teachers. This is a vital element in unifying a pipeline of pre-school through college education that serves both SUNY and New York.

This article is intended to invigorate the conversation that must take place for TeachNY to succeed. If we are to realize its goals, non-education faculty must broadly engage in wide-ranging, two-way communication with campus education leadership and faculty as well as supporters within System Administration around these issues. The charge to the TeachNY Advisory Council begins "TeachNY is an initiative of the State University of New York to transform teacher and school-leader preparation and development through the creation of bold new policy that will shape the discipline for decades to come."

The Advisory Council report was provided to key teacher education stakeholders at all SUNY institutions in May 2016.

TeachNY seeks a unified effort around five broad themes:
1. Recruit, select, and assure the cultural competence of teacher candidates
2. Renew and sustain educator preparation programs and partner with P-12 partners
3. Initiate new teachers into the profession and support their ongoing professional development
4. Demonstrate success by sound, research-based assessment and evaluation systems
5. Organize around a sustainable infrastructure of human and physical resources to sustain excellence into the future

In this essay I could not hope to elaborate fully on each of the elements of TeachNY. A Steering Committee is following up on the work of and the report from the Advisory Council released in May. To date, seven Regional Engagements have involved hundreds of stakeholders across New York to discuss relevant policies and to build an action plan for moving forward. On November 4, the Steering Committee will have had its second meeting to propose policy changes and continue this phase of proposed actions. Two more meetings of the Steering Committee will provide recommendations for the Board of Trustees' actions by mid-2017.

This policy-level, Phase-2 effort will lay the groundwork for Phase-3 initiatives (some of which have already begun). Phase 3 includes engaging the NYS Master Teacher program, the Regent's edTPA Task Force, the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) Clinical Practice Commission, the National Board Certification organization, and others. This phase will pilot initiatives like models of residency-based educator programs and work with CAEP - the national teacher education accreditation program. This is all with an eye to supporting effective change across the system.

Rather than reiterate the information in the report, I would like to explore an issue as an example of how campus-specific conversations might proceed on locally relevant topics that cut across and synthesize multiple themes. One overarching topic that should attract many constituencies of a campus is the role of information technology in TeachNY. Information technologies as problem-solving tools can
functions of the teacher. In 1923, Thomas Edison predicted that movies would replace blackboards and books in schools. By the 1960s the phrase “computer-assisted instruction” had entered the vocabulary of teachers and school reformers. For too long some have promoted the view of the future of schooling with the teacher as, at most, a curator of software and hardware with children freed from the time schedule and physical space of today’s schooling. Some reformers actually believe that day is not too far off. More tools of the asynchronous, on-demand education seem to crop up every day. There are video and podcast lectures, on-line courses that allow students to jump in whenever they are ready, apps to teach every subject on your phone, and “intelligent assistants” to help you find what you need to do next. Refining the instructional technologies and matching the artificial intelligence of the machines to the instructional decision-making ability of the teacher are the last small steps in this vision of teacher-less schooling. Given the history of predictions about educational technology and artificial intelligence, the path to better education in the 21st century will more likely be carved out by better human teachers with the most effective tools we can give them. We must also consider technology in the context of schools being pulled in multiple directions and our profession not having a clear sense of what we are trying to do. It’s hard to get somewhere effectively if you don’t know where you are going. The 2016 Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll showed that 50% of Americans believe the purpose of schooling is “academics” (although it is not clear there is any sort of consensus definition of what that is). The other half are more or less evenly split between seeing the purpose of schooling as developing citizens and preparing future employees for future jobs. Many of those future jobs we are preparing students for do not even exist today. While schools will never have one single, clearly-defined purpose, they must find a way to have a discussion to narrow the focus and move toward common goals. Only then can technology be focused on the improvement of teaching and educator preparation as conceived by TeachNY.

In an environment of schools being uncertain of their purpose, technology became a solution looking for a problem. I was a classroom teacher in 1979 when our school got its first “personal computer.” They gave it to me because I was the “science guy” and I must have some way I could put it to use. I made my district pay for me to go to the local college to take a programming course so I could make the Radio Shack TRS Model 80 do something. In a short 15 weeks, I wrote a program that my chemistry students could use to input the mass and volume of samples and the computer would tell them the density! The paper and pencils we had burned up before was spared as well as the time of students punching the numbers into their and recording their answers. This was a $5,000 solution to a $2 problem that ate up 45 hours of my time that semester. Yes, I did write many more programs for other purposes but I never really found it the best use of my time. Teaching is a job where you never finish all of the important to-do list items anyway. Therefore, teachers have to be time managers, every day deciding what useful thing will not get done.

Technology in schools kept looking for problems to solve until technology qua technology became the problem. Parents and potential employers demand that schools teach students to use computers, calculators, smart phones, and specific software and apps so they will be ready for those jobs that have not been created yet. At the same time, they also want their children to learn their times tables and grammar rules the same way they did. So we have flooded classrooms with electronic whiteboards, tablets, Chromebooks, and other gadgets into a curriculum designed for liberally educating well-rounded citizens in Post-WW II America.

In 1939, Harold Benjamin, under the pen name J. Abner Peddiwell, wrote an allegory for the staid educational establishment titled The Saber-Tooth Curriculum. The punch line was that schools created to teach protection against tigers will fail when the tigers are all gone but bears take their place. The story was meant to be an object lesson for educators that the skills and knowledge of the past will not serve the students or society of today to solve the problems confronting them. It’s a quick read or, if you prefer, watch it in less than five minutes on Vimeo https://vimeo.com/19515754 (irony intentional—DS).

If Benjamin was worried that the world of 1939 was moving too fast for an overly cautious school system, he would be gasping for breath today. I do the “let’s think about future jobs that don’t exist today” task in some of my classes. This exercise fuels a discussion of “How will you need to change as a teacher to meet the ever-evolving needs of schools and students?” We also talk about how to use technology as a problem-solving tool in the service of professional development.

Spending 150 years trying to build the electro-mechanical system that would make the teacher unnecessary has simply shown that
teaching and learning are not just about filling children with information and skills but are, instead, about human-to-human relationship building. Cognitive science has shown us that learning, and therefore teaching, is more complex than we imagined. While trying to find the app or software that can replace the teacher, we have spent much less time looking at how to use technology to develop and support great human teachers and students. We could apply technology to liberate teachers to spend more of their time connecting to students as individuals—but we don’t.

I believe the key to using technology to make teachers better teachers can be found by looking at how technology is used outside of our profession. As mentioned before, engineers, doctors, and lawyers use technology to get better at doing what they do rather than trying to replace human professionals. (I know about WebMD, Legal Zoom, et al. Would you really choose either of them over a human equivalent if your life actually depended on it? Would you be the first to drive across a bridge designed and built by VitalCiviengineer.com?)

These professionals use technology as humans with the need to access more and better information faster than they ever could. They process what they find to separate the sense from the nonsense (perhaps the most useful modern skill). They communicate with each other to build the body of knowledge of the profession and connect with others working on the same kinds of problems. Teachers empowered with technology and taught how to use it to make themselves better teachers must, in my mind, be the technology imperative of TeachNY.

In 1951, Isaac Asimov wrote “The Fun They Had,” a short story about children in the year 2157 who discover a “book.” Through their intelligent-machine teacher, they learn about “schools” children used to attend. They are shocked to find that there ever was a time when children went to one place to be taught by a human being. The joke foreshadowed by the title is how the children wax dreamily about the fun kids must have had when they got to go to “school”—a place of real human interaction. Serious projections of when we would see Artificial Intelligence that could replace human functions have been failing since at least the 1957 Dartmouth Conference. I have no faith in the prophets who say machines can replace the teacher are right around the corner.

Everything that is true of the need for teachers to be retooled to meet the future needs of students is true of the retooling that is needed in educator preparation programs. I could get into my thoughts and experiences on how my chosen profession should adapt to the demands of providing the next generation of teachers and school leaders, but that would require another entire essay. Keeping the focus on innovations with technology I would say the number one opportunity/challenge we have is in increasing the connections among people without overwhelming them with redundant and needless communications. If anything, communicating information is now too easy and we send everything to everyone to where the signal is lost in the noise.

Finally, I hope you, the reader, are peeved or frustrated at something I’ve said herein. If you are a non-education faculty member, I hope you will take this to one of your education colleagues and ask her/him if s/he believes the same nonsense as that doke from Geneseo. If you are on an education faculty, go to your Provost or Liberal Arts Dean and explain why I don’t speak for the entire education faculty, go to your Provost or Liberal Arts Dean and explain why I don’t speak for the entire education faculty, go to your Provost or Liberal Arts Dean and explain why I don’t speak for the entire education faculty, go to your Provost or Liberal Arts Dean and explain why I don’t speak for the entire education faculty.

November, 2016—Our society continues its struggle with racism, ableism, xenophobia, misogyny, transphobia, and homophobia. Though many citizens have been fighting for generations to create a society that does not discriminate or encourage violence against our minority populations, we know there is still a lot of work to do. It seems as if the election of Donald Trump has empowered some citizens—some of them our students—to act in ways that go against the stated values of SUNY and New York state. These actions are not new or unfamiliar.

Many of us gravitate towards higher education with the belief that we can find a more inclusive and safe space to live and work, and New York state and SUNY can certainly be a haven compared to other states and other state systems, but we can do better. First we must address any suggestion of or act of intimidation on our campuses. Campus leaders must act quickly and conscientiously to remove students from our campuses who engage in these behaviors. They must also make their actions known to the campus and reiterate the values of the campus. Many of our campuses seem to understand this and act accordingly.

However, to really improve our campus climates, we must also address the discrimination and discriminatory violence that takes place off our campuses. These teachable moments present important opportunities for faculty from all disciplines to bring discussions of equity and inclusion into the classroom and to develop our students’ cultural competencies.

How we do this and what we do will depend on who we are, our lived experiences, and how comfortable we feel discussing these issues. Improving our comfort levels can come through professional development training, but it will also come if and when we make a concerted effort to develop relationships with colleagues and community members who come from under-represented groups, and who we may not have significant interpersonal interactions with. It is these prolonged conversations that will truly make a difference in the future of SUNY.

---

**Timothy W. Gerken**  
Morrisville State College  
Chair UFS Committee on Equity, Inclusion, & Diversity

(Editor’s note: The Diversity Corner is a place for conversation about equity and inclusion. We hope to present a variety of voices, so if you have ideas for an article please let Tim Gerken, who is responsible for this new continuing column, know by sending it to him (gerken_tw@morrisville.edu).
By working together, we can expand the structural and interactional diversity on our campuses.

One obvious way to do this is to increase the diversity of our faculty, staff, and administration. Statistics show that our faculty and staff population is not as diverse as our student body: “the trend in employees at SUNY identifying as URMs (Under Represented Minorities) has shown an incremental increase over the period from Fall 2007 to Fall 2015 (11.9% to 12.6%)”; however, SUNY’s URMs student population is almost 25%. The SUNY Board of Trustees (BOT) passed a diversity policy in September 2015 which mandates that “each campus and SUNY Administration will develop comprehensive strategic diversity and inclusion plans” that increase the number of URMs in our faculty, staff, and administration. These endeavors are not easy. And, they do not end once the individual is on our campus. There is a significant amount of work we must do to keep these individuals on our campuses. Researcher Kerry Ann O’Meara has written about how “universities are losing talent because of bias in academic reward systems and work environments. Having engaged in exit interviews and retention studies of faculty leaving the academy, it is clear universities pay a major price by not acknowledging bias and expanding their definitions of scholarship in terms of the diversity of people and contributions they attract, retain, and advance.” It is time for us to reexamine continuing appointment and promotion procedures that work to benefit SUNY’s Strategic Agenda.

In 2013 the University Faculty Senate Diversity and Cultural Competence Committee presented a Position Paper entitled Making Diversity Count: “This paper calls for policy changes in the faculty reward system: we are specifically asking that diversity be included as one of the criteria for faculty evaluation throughout SUNY . . . .” Its suggestions provide ways to support SUNY’s Strategic Agenda. Provost Cartwright wrote in the Spring/Summer 2016 Faculty Senate Bulletin: “Diversity, equity, and inclusion: This is about people, who we are and who we serve. It’s about ensuring that everyone who comes to study or work at SUNY feels welcome and knows that their opinions will be respected. Our work here cuts across all five areas of SUNY Excels: access, completion, success, inquiry, and engagement.”

In January 2015 the Board of Trustees endorsed “SUNY Excels as the University’s performance system and the key driver of the Power of SUNY strategic plan for the next five years.” Through the five priority areas, system will “be seeing out and tracking inclusive Excellence across metrics in all five priority areas.” If Excels is going to measure diversity in all five areas, it is important to look at the contribution to “inclusive Excellence” our current tenured faculty and professional staff make. I think if we do this honestly, we will see that the lack of URMs faculty and staff on our campuses significantly limits “institutional diversity as part of the mission and vision of the educational institution.”

To develop diversity and inclusive excellence in all of the Excel areas, we must reconsider the wide range of activities that are used to evaluate and award continuing appointment and promotion. The five areas—mastery of subject matter, effectiveness in teaching, effectiveness in university service, scholarly ability, and continuing growth if evaluated equally and with the objective of supporting SUNY’s strategic plan—provide the opportunities we need to fulfill our mission. However, we know on most campuses and in most departments throughout the system, scholarly ability is weighted more heavily than the other four criteria combined. “Publish or perish” is a common way of phrasing this inequity. Not only do faculty have to publish, they have to publish in the “right” places and many departments require a published book in order for a faculty member to be awarded continuing appointment or promotion.

Every time any faculty member chooses to not be involved in programs that support Excels’ five areas because they feel they will be pulled away from their research—which is a very likely scenario—students, programs, and the campus community suffer because fewer individuals then have to do this work. This leads to burnout, it leads to a limited number of perspectives being promoted, and it reinforces privilege.

Faculty and staff from URMs are often tasked with extra-service because they become the unofficial “advisor” to students who see few faculty or staff that look like them, the “diversity” representative on committees, task forces, and panels that are looking to make sure they meet a “diversity” requirement, and the “diversity” voice on issues facing their campus. Cis-gendered, straight, white males generally do not face any of these additional pressures.

However, it is important to acknowledge that many of our faculty and staff who are not URMs’ work hard to support diversity efforts on their campuses and across SUNY. They too struggle to improve our campus climate and support the Excel’s framework, while trying to do their research and get the publications they need to be promoted. I have served with these dedicated faculty and staff during my time on the University Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and I have watched as some of them go back to their campuses, so they can do the research they need to get promoted.

Inquiry is the only Excels’ metric that specifically addresses research and publications. Examining the criteria for evaluating a campus and the one for tenure and promotion, we see that research is only one of the five criteria in each of the two evaluative frameworks. Yet, we allow one criteria—scholarly ability—to be more influential on the success of the entire campus than the other criteria combined. I believe this undermines SUNY’s Strategic Agenda.

Just at the role of SUNY and our individual campuses have changed over the years, the role of faculty and professional staff has also changed. If SUNY Excels is truly a “performance system that drives continuous improvement toward Excellence at all levels—system, sector, campus, faculty, student, and staff,” then we must change the way we understand the criteria for continuing appointment and promotion. This is a time for Shared Governance to come together and make changes. Campus Governance Leaders (CGLs), Department Chairs, Deans, Chief Diversity Officers, Chief Academic Officers, College Presidents, SUNY’s senior administration, and the SUNY Board of Trustees must determine how to account for the work done by the faculty and staff that drive our “continuous improvement toward Excellence.” Without this change, we will never be able to live up to the goals of the BOT’s Resolution on SUNY Excels.

It is important that this be a system-wide change. We cannot have some campuses or certain departments on certain campuses where scholarly ability remains the overriding factor determining the outcome of a faculty member. It must be measured equally with the
other criteria. Because it is a system-wide change, it must affect all faculty members equally.

These ideas are not new. Kerry Ann O’Meara has been doing research in Academic Reward Systems for over 15 years. She has argued that “reform of promotion and tenure policies should improve the ability of the academic reward system to acknowledge and support the diversity of individuals and contributions. Such reform does not lower a bar, or compromise the quality of scholarship deemed excellent. Instead, it opens up more ways, for more scholars, to make a case for the excellence of their work, work that should be held to the highest standards appropriate to their form and content.”

The Power of SUNY is the power of our efforts. Our guiding principals suggest we should be “ambitious and visionary.” We have the opportunity with Excels to expand and enhance our continuing appointment and promotion criteria. We can value engaged scholarship, community engagement, teaching, and service that improves access, completion, success, and retention. It is time we move to evaluate faculty and staff in a way that supports systemness: a system that is more equitable and more inclusive.

THE DIVERSITY COLUMN

American foreign policy, coined “The Monroe Doctrine,” has endured.

Though James Monroe is given praise for his achievements that occurred before and during his presidency, Elizabeth’s accomplishments are often overlooked. Further, she is unjustly rated poorly as First Lady. The following essay sheds some additional light on the nation’s fifth president and, especially, on the first First Lady from New York State.

NYS’s Elizabeth Kortright Monroe: La Belle Américaine saves Adrienne, Marquise de la Lafayette, during the French Revolution

During their event-filled lives, James and Elizabeth Monroe experienced the turbulent politics of a new nation; faced peril in Paris during the French Revolution; participated in history’s largest peaceful land acquisition—the Louisiana Purchase; promoted the “Era of Good Feelings”; and helped postpone for decades the American civil war via the Missouri Compromise of 1820. James Monroe declared in his 1823 “Address to Congress” that the Western Hemisphere was “off-limits” to European colonization. This harsh winter encampment at Valley Forge in 1778, Monroe, now at the rank of Major, shared a tent with fellow Virginian, Lieutenant John Marshall—later the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. In 1780, Virginia Governor Thomas Jefferson promoted Monroe to a full colonelcy in the state’s militia. He was also simultaneously appointed Virginia Military Commissioner to the Southern Continental Army. Three years later, Monroe was elected to the Virginia House of Delegates and also represented his state in the Congress of the Confederation. From November 7, 1785 until November 3, 1786, Congress met in the nation’s temporary capital in New-York City (spelled with a hyphen until the five boroughs united into the “City of Greater New York” on January 1, 1898).

While in New-York City, 27-year old Monroe was introduced to 17-year old Elizabeth Kortright. Born on June 30, 1768, Elizabeth was provided with a well-rounded liberal education. She was an excellent student who was proficient in French and other European languages. Petite at five feet in height, Elizabeth possessed expressive blue eyes and a beautiful face enhanced by sumptuous brunette hair. She came from a Nederlander family that was originally named van Kortryk. Upon first laying eyes on Elizabeth, James was instantly smitten with her beauty and intelligence. After a brief courtship, they married on February 16, 1786 at Trinity Church, an Episcopal place of worship situated at the northern end of Wall Street in lower Manhattan. This centuries-old church is still operational at its original site—one block from the original World Trade Center that was destroyed on September 11, 2001.

CELEBRATING NEW YORK STATE AND NEW YORKERS

Dr. Daniel Scott Marrone, Farmingdale State College (Retired)

German artist Emmanuel Gottlieb Leutze painted “Washington Crossing the Delaware,” in 1851. Lieutenant James Monroe is standing behind Washington holding the 13-star U.S.A. flag. (Collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, NY.)

James and Elizabeth Monroe: Early Lives

During the Revolutionary War, James Monroe (1758-1831) fought with valor in the battles of Harlem Heights, Brandywine, Germantown, and Monmouth. At the pivotal Battle of Trenton, on December 26, 1776, Lieutenant Monroe was shot in the chest and nearly died from his wound. Remarkably, the strapping six-foot tall, 18-year old Virginian fully recovered and by 1777 was promoted to Captain. During the

Sketch of Trinity Church made about the time of the Monroe marriage in the late 1700’s.

Photograph of Trinity Church with the original World Trade Center in the background.

The newlyweds lived with Elizabeth’s widowed father, Lawrence Kortright, in a large though somewhat unkempt Manhattan manse. Elizabeth’s mother, née Hannah Aspinwall, lived
from 1735 to 1777. The Aspinwalls are directly related to another iconic Dutch New York family, the Roosevelts of Hyde Park. (President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's youngest son was named John Aspinwall Roosevelt). James Monroe planned to bring his new bride back to Virginia when his term in the Congress of the Confederation ended. By then, Elizabeth was pregnant and loath to leave her elderly father as well as her brothers and sisters—all residing in New York City. Nevertheless, she dutifully relocated to Virginia. In a letter to friend Thomas Jefferson, James proudly wrote of his vivacious New York wife. Monroe remarked: “She left her state and her family and became a good Virginian.”

With a stellar reputation as a war hero and for his diligent service in the Congress of the Confederation, Monroe readily established a law practice with many clients in his home state. In April 1787, voters in Fredericksburg elected him to the Virginia Assembly in Richmond. A year later, the two “James,” Madison and Monroe, vied to be the first person elected to the newly formed U.S. House of Representatives for a two-year term beginning in 1789. Madison won the election. However, in a situation where “one door closes and another opens,” an unfortunate death in Monroe’s family created a sad though lucky situation for the Virginia lawyer. William Grayson, Monroe’s cousin, was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1788 and served from 1789 until his sudden death due to heart failure on March 12, 1790. Grayson was the first person to die while serving in elected office of the U.S. government. Grayson’s death created a potential opportunity for Monroe, who submitted his name to the Virginia legislature for filling the now vacant U.S. Senate seat. In fall 1790, the legislature voted its approval for Monroe to complete Grayson’s senate term. The 32-year-old lawyer was sworn-in as U.S. Senator representing Virginia in December 1790.

**The Monroes in Paris**

In July 1789, a rebellion in France commenced that would forever alter world history. The French Revolution quickly devolved into mass murder of an estimated 41,000 victims. During this upheaval, Thomas Jefferson was U.S. Minister to France. In September 1789, he left Paris for home to serve as President Washington’s—and the nation’s—first Secretary of State. In filling Jefferson’s post, Washington chose a Federalist colleague, Gouverneur Morris, as Minister to France. While in Paris, Morris publicly denounced the 1793 executions of French King Louis XVI and Queen Marie Antoinette. In response, the insurrectionists now controlling France demanded the immediate recall of Morris, who then hastily left for America. Washington then offered this diplomatic post to James Monroe. James and Elizabeth along with seven-year-old daughter, Eliza, sailed to France and landed at the port of Le Havre on July 31, 1794. Here they heard the shocking news of the three-days earlier beheadings of Maximilien de Robespierre and other “Reign of Terror” conspirators. Upon their deaths, France next entered into a somewhat more stable but still deadly era known as the “Thermidorian Reaction.”

A French insurrectionist holding a severed head of someone who had just been guillotined during the “Reign of Terror.”

**La Belle Américaine: American Hero**

Monroe and his articulate, French-speaking wife were captivated with France. The French were, in turn, besotted with Elizabeth whom they called La Belle Américaine. Gorgeous, Elizabeth was also courageous. Amid the “Reign of Terror” and continuing in the “Thermidorian Reaction” years, those of noble birth were being summarily guillotined. In 1794, Adrienne, a noblewoman and wife of Continental Army general, the Marquis de La Fayette (proper French spelling of surname), was imprisoned awaiting execution. This was the fate that befell Adrienne’s sister, mother, and grandmother. Her uncle, diplomat Emmanuel Marie Louis de Noailles, begged Minister James Monroe to save his niece. As an American official, Monroe considered it his duty to obtain the release of the wife of the Marquis de La Fayette. However, Monroe feared that the French insurgents would misconstrue his actions to free the noblewoman as unwelcome American meddling in their revolution. So Monroe devised an indirect plan for Adrienne’s rescue. The Americans would demonstrate to the French that Adrienne, wife of a former American general, was under the protection of the U.S. government. James intended for one of his aides to represent the U.S. government in undertaking the release of Adrienne, Marquise de La Fayette. Anyone carrying out this plan risked imprisonment and possible execution. To the shock of her husband, Elizabeth volunteered to carry out the rescue plan. James was deeply opposed to Elizabeth risking her life. Most reluctantly, James finally acquiesced to his persistent wife.

**Portrait of Elizabeth Kortright Monroe, aged 26, painted by Swiss artist Louis Sene in Paris (1794).**

In his brief autobiography, James Monroe stated:

“I procured a carriage as soon as I could and had it put in the best order with the markings of ‘Minister of the United States of America.’ In this carriage Mrs. Monroe drove directly to the prison in which Madame Lafayette was confined. Inquiry was made by the prison guards as to whose carriage was it? The answer given was the American Minister. Who is in it? His wife. What brought her here? To see Madame Lafayette.”

Accompanied only by two coachmen, La Belle Américaine bravely entered the death row prison and demanded to see Adrienne. Elizabeth met with and assured the French noblewoman that she would soon be freed. Elizabeth exited the prison loudly proclaiming to the guards and the bloodthirsty mobs outside the jail in flawless French that Adrienne should be released because the young woman was under the protection of the U.S. government. James intended for one of his aides to represent the U.S. government in undertaking the release of Adrienne, Marquise de La Fayette. Anyone carrying out this plan risked imprisonment and possible execution. To the shock of her husband, Elizabeth volunteered to carry out the rescue plan. James was deeply opposed to Elizabeth risking her life. Most reluctantly, James finally acquiesced to his persistent wife.
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Madame Marie Adrienne Françoise de Noailles, Marquise de Lafayette, was spared execution in Paris through the efforts of New Yorker, Elizabeth Kortright Monroe.

James Monroe sent to France to negotiate the Louisiana Purchase

Following his diplomatic service in France, James and family returned to America and built a home called “Highland” in Charlottesville, Virginia, near close friend, Thomas Jefferson in 1799. Later that year, Monroe was elected governor of Virginia. He was re-elected in 1801 and 1802. All told, he served as governor from December 28, 1799 until December 1, 1802. On January 10, 1803, Monroe received an urgent note from President Jefferson “to join Minister Robert R. Livingston in Paris in an effort to purchase a site at the mouth of the Mississippi to be used as a port of deposit” (Ammon, p. 203). The third U.S. president needed Monroe’s expertise as the nation’s “Envoy Extraordinary to France and Spain.” Rumors were circulating, later proven to be accurate, that Spain had ceded to France the Louisiana Territory, a vast extent of land the precise boundaries of which were unknown at the time. With France continually at war with Great Britain and its European allies, Général Napoléon required additional cash to continue his conquests across the continent. As timing was critical, Jefferson pleaded with Monroe to immediately leave for France. Monroe was instructed, with a relatively free hand in terms of price, to purchase the port of New Orleans and secure navigation rights to the Mississippi River.

Before sailing to France, the Monroes visited Kortright family members in New-York City. The Monroes sailed from the city in early 1803. Transatlantic travel during the era of sailing ships was always perilous. The winter of 1803 was especially harsh with ice storms and mountainous squalls rocking their vessel incessantly rendering them all seasick. In addition, Elizabeth was now being afflicted with rheumatism, an ailment that would plague her for the rest of her life. After their 29-day arduous journey, the Monroes arrived at the port of Le Havre on April 8, 1803. They were welcomed with celebrations featuring numerous displays of French and American flags. Awaiting Monroe’s arrival was U.S. Ambassador to France, Robert Robert Livingston (whose first and middle names were Robert; 1746-1834). Livingston had already begun negotiations with the French. Général Napoléon desperately needed cash. Thus, France was eager to sell its newly acquired Louisiana Territory. As perhaps the best land acquisition deal in history, Monroe and Livingston were offered the entire Louisiana Territory for 80 million francs (the equivalent of $15,000,000 computing to just $.04 per acre). At 828,000 square miles, the Louisiana Purchase was greater in land area than France, Great Britain, Ireland, Portugal, and Spain combined! Not only did the nation expand in size, so did the Monroe family. While in Paris, Elizabeth gave birth to a second daughter, Maria Hester Monroe. Reflecting his Scottish/Welsh ancestry, Monroe pronounced the baby’s first name as “Ma-ri-ah.”

The War of 1812

In 1810, President Madison appointed Monroe as Secretary of State. As the Federalist Party dwindled in political support, the Democratic-Republicans were gaining political strongholds in the U.S. south and west as well as in cities with burgeoning immigrant populations such as New-York City, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. The Democratic-Republicans favored expanding into new territories, embodied in the notion later dubbed “Manifest Destiny.” Speaker of the House Representative Henry Clay, Sr. of Kentucky and the so-called “War Hawks” advocated for the conquest of Canada. Understandably, this alarmed the British. However, it was the involuntary impregnation of American sailors into the British Royal Navy that was the most egregious dispute between the U.S.A. and her former mother country. At President Madison’s urgent request, the U.S. Congress declared war on Great Britain on June 18, 1812. What was Madison thinking? Compared to the Royal Army and Navy, the American forces were pitifully inadequate. This, no doubt, explains why at the beginning of the war, Americans were soundly defeated in several key land battles. The Americans also raided Canada several times. During one of these attacks, the “Yanks” burned York—present day Toronto. This misguided assault into Canada spurred the British to vengeance. Thus, in 1814, the predominant British military mandate was to torch Washington City as “payback” for the burning of York. In August of that year, the British invaded Maryland with a massive land force. With overwhelming numbers, the British overran American defenses at the Battle of Bladensburg. Facing no further resistance, the British marched unmolested into Washington City and proceeded to torch many U.S. government buildings including the Executive Mansion.

However, the British were defeated in September 1814 at the combined land Battle of Blattsburgh and sea Battle of Lake Champlain in northern New York State. The Royal Navy was also thwarted at a star-shaped fortress guarding Baltimore harbor called Fort McHenry. After a 25-hour naval bombardment, the British (and attorney/poet Francis Scott Key) saw a gigantic U.S.A. garrison flag unfurled at the fort on September 13, 1814. This, of course, was the iconic “Star-Spangled Banner.” Since the British could not defeat the Americans defending Baltimore harbor, the Royal Navy began departing Chesapeake Bay. On the next day, September 14, President Madison fired woefully inept Secretary of War John Armstrong and appointed James Monroe as his replacement. The 56-year old Monroe was now both Secretary of State and Secretary of War. With these enormous responsibilities, Monroe drew up plans to build a standing army of 100,000 soldiers in the nation’s defense. Thankfully, the war was coming to an end. The War of 1812 formally ended on Christmas Eve, December 24, 1814, with the signing of a peace treaty at the Belgium city of Ghent. However, news reached America of the peace treaty after Major General Andrew Jackson victoriously led an array of Americans, from a polyglot of ethnic and racial backgrounds, at the Battle of New Orleans in January 1815. On February 18, 1815, the U.S. Senate ratified the Treaty of Ghent. The U.S.A. gained no new territories in the war. However, the nation attained something far more important—it demonstrated that it could defy itself against the world’s most formidable army and navy!

Monroe becomes President; Elizabeth becomes incapacitated

On March 4, 1817, Monroe was inaugurated fifth U.S. president. During the Monroe Administration, the nation remained at peace with a minimum of partisan turmoil. Monroe visited Boston later that year. Federalist-leaning journalist and publisher Benjamin Russell wrote in the Columbian Sentinel on July 12 that “the nation was at peace and united.” Russell proclaimed that the U.S.A. was entering an “Era of Good Feelings.” During the Monroe presidency, the nation continued to expand. Spanish Minister Luis de Onís y Gonzales-Vara and Secretary of State John Quincy Adams reached an agreement whereby Spain ceded its Florida territories to the U.S.A. In 1820, Monroe fervently advocated for and was glad to sign into law the “Missouri Compromise.” With this critically important agreement, the
nation defused for decades the threat of war between the “North” and the “South” over the accused “peculiar institution of slavery.” Americans were also flexing power on a global basis. Based on a principle that the European powers must not interfere in the Western Hemisphere, Monroe adopted a document prepared by Secretary of State Adams. On December 2, 1823, President Monroe included this document within his address to Congress. Monroe declared that the U.S.A. would hereby protect the newly independent, former colonies of Spain against any aggression by European powers. This principle of a western hemispheric shield of protection became known as the “Monroe Doctrine.”

While James was attaining major successes in his presidency, Elizabeth was suffering from progressively worsening illnesses. Elizabeth, now in her fifties, attempted to fulfill her First Lady responsibilities. However, she was often ill and, in any event, could not match the social elan and verve of her celebrated predecessor Dolley Madison. Cokie Roberts, in Ladies of Liberty: The Women Who Shaped Our Nation, writes: “Elizabeth Monroe was no Dolley Madison, who would be an impossible act to follow” (p. 319). Whereas Dolley would doff elaborately feathered, turbaned hats and joyously intertwine with congressional wives and foreign diplomats, Elizabeth was more restrained in her dealings with guests and frequently absent from official events in the newly repaired Executive Mansion. Tragically, Elizabeth was now also suffering from epilepsy. For political and privacy reasons, Monroe was unwilling to publicly reveal his wife’s illnesses. The partisan press thus inaccurately portrayed Elizabeth’s absence from public appearances as aloofness and arrogance. Her reputation as First Lady was diminished. On New Year’s Day in 1825, James and Elizabeth Monroe held their last major “levee” in the Executive Mansion. Elizabeth’s appearance at this event has been described as follows: “Though no longer young, she is still a very handsome woman.”

Portraits of James and Elizabeth Monroe late in life. 

James and Elizabeth Monroe: The Final Years

Nine months after leaving the presidency, Monroe wrote to his son-in-law, Samuel Laurence Gouverneur, and daughter Maria Monroe Gouverneur, who lived in New-York City that Elizabeth “had a convulsion, which was attended with the most painful consequences.” Elizabeth suffered an epileptic seizure near a lit fireplace. When she awoke, she was burned over much of her body. Elizabeth never fully recovered. She died on September 23, 1830 at age 62. James was devastated by the loss of his wife of 44 years. Following Elizabeth’s death, the former president moved in with his son-in-law and daughter in New-York City. Upon Elizabeth’s death, James told family and friends that he would not live long. His ominous prediction proved true, for he died less than 10 months later at age 73. In an ironic twist of fate, New-York-born Elizabeth died in Virginia; Virginia-born James Monroe died in New-York City. His death on July 4, 1831 was exactly 55 years to the day after the signing of the Declaration of Independence. For service to his nation as a soldier, minister, and president, James Monroe was a great American. For her courage in saving Adrienne, Marquise de La Fayette, and for providing unceasing loving support to her beleaguered husband throughout his very long public service career, Elizabeth Kortright Monroe deserves much recognition as well.
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Regarding TeachNY

“Recruit more teachers, more diverse, especially in STEM!”

“More Master Teachers!” — Certainly, who’d not approve that goal?
That means more pay, prestige, professional dev. for all of them—
Of course with SUNY poised to train them for their crucial role.
But although many campuses began with just that mission,
Some felt that lacked prestige and interfered with “mission creep,”
And some because of placement issues and cost of supervision
Considered Teacher Education’s price was much too steep.
The vicious cycle started, teaching kept on losing luster,
The “best and brightest” choosing more lucrative pursuits,
This left behind some candidates who just didn’t pass muster,
So to survive we wandered further from our hallowed roots.
Let’s hope that TeachNY succeeds and give it our support—
It calls for lots of PSAs and for the career a path
And new found pride and salaries, intending thus to court
The best and diverse teachers into sciences and math.

[The poet parenthetically hopes there is not neglect
Of other subjects’ budgets, please don’t cut them to the bone!
We need more scientists and engineers, but should reflect
We humans and our cultures do not live by STEM alone.]
The PSAs will also show it’s crucial for our state.
As well as for our country that the taxpayers agree
The vicious cycle must be stopped, or else we face the fate

Of no replacement as each teacher becomes retiree.
And should some SUNY rank and file be doubtful, please just think
How wonderful to have a year when you don’t have to gripe
“We have to reteach high school— civilization’s at the brink”
Once students taught by Master Teachers all come through the pipe.
The program also promises more freedom to innovate,
Less “Stepford” strangling syllabi, more mentoring of course,
Less “bean-counting” mentality, a thing we also hate,
Perhaps reducing districts’ numbers of “bean counter” forceExpect no sudden turnaround, the frosh vote with their feet
And for a while a teacher won’t be top career of choice,
And campuses will each still have enrollment goals to meet—
So all depends on how persuasive is the SUNY voice.

But meantime boomer retirees who have gotten bored,
And graduates who now regret the field and job they chose.
Part-timers, CC, out of staters—while we await the horde
Of freshman teacher wannabes, cannot we work with those?
They’re likely more mature who did their “applied learning” first,
Have context, content depth, and more developed people skills,
And in the subject matter some already are well versed,
And better grasp society, its challenges and ills.
There’s also all those teachers who abandoned the profession
That TeachNY’s objectives may draw back into the fold
Whom we could teach and certify that they are in possession
Of pedagogy and/or facts not rusty or too old.
And, finally, consider how this helps some questions burning
For SUNY folk who feel as though their limits they are reaching:
All TE programs are, perforce, “experiential learning,”
And “outreach”? What is worth more than improving local teaching?
A summary of the highlights of the Winter Plenary, including committee reports, sector reports, presentations, and resolutions, can be found on the SUNY Faculty Senate website. www.system.suny.edu/facultysenate