

Connection

Binghamton Chapter, United University Professions



According to Informed Sources:

Candace Seeks Thrill of BU Administration!



Who Is This Woman and Why Would She Want to Do This?

by Stanley Scobie
Bartle Professor, Psychology

Some eyes are on the 2004 national presidential election, but the presidency of the Binghamton campus is also coming up. Of course, college and university presidents don't have prescribed terms nor are there term limits, but usually they don't remain in office longer than 10 years or so. President De Fleur has been president longer than all – or nearly all – SUNY presidents; she's been here since 1991.

During that time the campus has changed; in fact, it is just now beginning its third cycle of "strategic planning," that is, developing a plan for the next five to ten years. So, who will be president here during the

next decade?

In conversation with President De Fleur, she has said quite clearly that another ten years is not in the picture for her. However, a widely circulated rumor has surfaced recently with some apparent legitimacy that SUNY Trustee Candace de Russey is interested in the presidency at Binghamton.

De Russey is undoubtedly the most visible of our trustees, the one who triggered much of the faculty concern a few years ago that led to a vote of no confidence in the trustees by the Faculty Senate here and at most other SUNY campuses, as well as by the University Senate. She holds a PhD in French and has taught a little bit. She seems inde-

continued on page 8

From the Chapter President

What's Your Vision for Campus' Future?

by Darryl Wood

Binghamton's UUP Chapter wants to know what you think. We are concerned with your vision of the University and want to present your ideas to the administration.

As I noted in a letter to you early in October, the Executive Board is interested in identifying the essence of scholarship and professionalism, the optimal characteristics of our student body, and the ideal work environment. We invited more than 25 academics and professionals, representing all areas of the University, to a series of focus groups in October. There was great consistency among the groups regarding the issues facing the University over the next several years. Their comments are guiding us in development of the survey, to be distributed in early Spring 2004.

Binghamton's past and your experiences provide a common basis for looking to the future. Harpur College's glorious history as a premier liberal arts school forms the foundation for what became SUNY at Binghamton. Harpur's outstanding reputation continued as the professional schools were added in the late '60s and early '70s. Graduate programs were also added as Binghamton expanded to full university center status.

Budget vagaries have forced the campus to grow in fits and starts. Recently, the campus has emphasized research, especially exter-

continued on page 4

Connection

Binghamton Chapter newsletter
Number 50 November 18, 2003

Editor

George D. McKee
gmckee@binghamton.edu

Circulation Manager

Beth Kilmarx

An official publication of the Binghamton Chapter of the United University Professions, Local 2190 of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, and affiliated with New York State United Teachers; the Binghamton Chapter is a member of the Broome County Federation of Labor.

The opinions expressed in this newsletter are those of the authors or of the Binghamton Chapter and are not necessarily the opinions of United University Professions.

The editor welcomes letters and other comments of interest to the Binghamton Chapter.

UUP Chapter Officers

Darryl Wood
dwood@binghamton.edu
President

James A. Dix
dix@binghamton.edu
Vice President for Academics

Fran Goldman
frances@binghamton.edu
Vice President for Professionals

Edward Shephard
Secretary/Treasurer

Jeanne Eichelberger (Co-chair)
Mary Beth Willis (Co-chair)
George McKee
Darryl M. Wood
Grievance Committee

Dennis Selzner
Labor Relations Specialist

Kathy Zentz
Chapter Assistant
uup@binghamton.edu

Chapter phone 777-4382

From the Vice President for Professionals

Leave, Promotion Concern BU Professionals

**by Frances L. Goldman
Asian and Asian American
Studies Program**

Over the course of the past couple of months I have been meeting with and talking to UUP professionals from different areas of the campus. The purpose of these meetings has been to get to know everyone better and to learn of any issues and/or concerns that pertain to terms and conditions of employment and how UUP may be able to lend assistance.

As you may surmise, the issues were broad and varied, such as the difference between a promotion and a salary increase, or how to document an increase in ones' duties and responsibilities.

I heard many positive comments about how we do our jobs and the consistent willingness of professional employees to go well beyond the boundaries of their performance programs.

However, what was disquieting was the number of comments made about the lack of understanding on the part of supervisors in response to short-term medical or family issues which might necessitate a discussion con-

cerning some flexibility on a temporary basis in order to address these issues. In no instance were the individuals unwilling to meet their work obligation or refusing to take leave credits when appropriate.

On the other hand, it seems that supervisors are more than willing to ask for a change to staff's college year obligations without due consultation.

Another area of concern was the dearth of promotional ladders for professional staff. For some, their awareness of positions being filled without an apparent search exacerbated the situation. This issue has been discussed at labor/management meetings and continues to be on UUP's agenda.

While we all recognize the budgetary constraints under which the University is currently operating, and are more than willing to go the extra mile, issues such as these raise red flags that we must all be aware of.



UUP's First Town Hall Meeting Explores Role of Higher Education in Economic Development

At the first UUP co-sponsored Town Hall Meeting, November 4, an event for benefit of the regional community, as well as the University, Chapter President Darryl Wood (left) spoke with invited speaker Maurice Hinchey (right), in company with Tyrone Webb, CSEA Local president, and Kate Gregory, PEF assistant division leader – whose organizations were also co-sponsors.



System-Wide Assessment: How We Got to Where We Are

by Peter Knuepfer
Dept. of Geological Sciences
and Environmental Studies;
University Faculty Senator

Considerable publicity recently has surrounded a proposal or plan by the SUNY System Administration to impose a system-wide program of value-added assessment, following a hastily arranged vote by the Board of Trustees in June.

Most of the newspaper articles have described this as one or more standardized tests that would be given to SUNY students to measure how much they've learned in parts of their general education program.

It has been clear for at least five years that System Administration wished to assess general education outcomes across SUNY using "standardized" measures. Faculty, through campus governance bodies and the University Faculty Senate, have consistently opposed system-wide testing or assessment; given the campus-specific nature of our general education programs, the only feasible way to assess them is designed campus by campus. Faculty across SUNY have invested considerable time and energy in devising and implementing campus-based assessment programs for the general education curriculum and wish to see them work.

Chancellor King has made it clear in the last year that he embraces the idea of system-wide assessment for the purposes of "accountability" – supposedly showing "stakeholders" how much SUNY students are learning. Early this year the chancellor asked the president of the UFS (Joe Hildreth from Potsdam) and the president of the Faculty Council of Community Colleges (at the time, Bob Axelrod from Rockland) to convene a group to meet with SUNY Provost Peter Salins to address faculty concerns on assessment. I joined this discussion group (reluctantly) as a representative of the University Centers.

**The ball is in the
faculty's court to
prevent ill-advised,
expensive testing.**

We met a number of times during the summer and again during the fall. The faculty members who were involved tried to move System Administration away from their insistence on "standard metrics" and standardized testing across the system, with very limited success. The discussion group worked on a report (called a Memorandum of Understanding at the insistence of System Administration) that would outline a process for developing system-wide assessment to measure the "value added" in general education in math, writing, critical reasoning, information management, and scientific and social scientific methods. The document was also to address faculty concerns. This was to be discussed and voted by the faculty governance bodies at their fall plenary meetings.

We expected the faculty would vote down the proposal involving uniform standards administered centrally across the system, but this "value-added" uniform approach was the best we could get from the provost, so even as we participated in the discussions, we felt that the positions of System Administration were too rigid to be acceptable.

Trustee Candace de Russy placed obstacles in this path. First, she invited herself to the initial meeting of this discussion group in May, despite efforts by Provost Salins and Chancellor King to convince her that it was a closed, informal meeting. Apparently she agreed to observe only, as she kept silent for the entire four-hour meeting (any of you who know her will realize how much of

an effort this was on her part). She apparently was pleased with the progress of that initial meeting.

However, soon more mischief was afoot. She proposed a resolution for the board at its June 18 meeting that would have required system-wide assessment along the direction that Administration was proposing, but with public reporting of results by campus – clearly designed for ulterior motives. The chancellor tried to head this off (particularly the reporting stipulation), but believed that de Russy had gathered the votes to pass this resolution. So the day before the trustees' meeting, the chancellor "proposed" an alternate resolution mandating system-wide value-added assessment. This was passed by the board after an attempt to table the resolution – proposed by the student trustee, Stephanie Gross of SUNY Oneonta – failed for lack of a second. Faculty governance leaders were not offered the opportunity to speak until after the vote, at which time they pointed out how precipitous the board's action had been.

We withdrew from discussion for some period because of this betrayal of a constructive process, but faculty agreed to return to the table late in the summer to see if anything could be salvaged. A proposed MOU was presented in October to the governance bodies. The Faculty Council asked the board to rescind its resolution. The University Faculty Senate on October 25 passed a resolution
continued on page 7

Amy Goodman to Speak in February

Amy Goodman, host of "Democracy Now" on WSQX public radio, will visit the campus in February. This is a postponement of her visit scheduled for November. Details will follow.



Parking in the Woodlands: View of the Auto Environment

by Julian Shepherd
Biology

Yet another campus natural area was lost to a parking lot this summer.

After some discussion with and opposition from student and faculty/staff environmental groups, the Administration went ahead with a plan to create a little more than 100 new parking spaces by demolishing a 1.4-acre island of 50-year-old forest near the West Gym.

This followed the loss of a much larger natural area south of the "Brain" to create Mountainview College: more than 50 percent of that area is dedicated to more than 500 new parking spaces.

How many more of our natural areas will be destroyed for more parking? Is the woods near the East Gym next, where some of our richest wildflower communities survive?

Future of the Campus?

continued from page 1

nally funded grants. We have also increased enrollment and added Division I athletics. New graduate programs have been added and some old ones deactivated. The state's funding formulas have forced some of these decisions. Other decisions are the result of campus-based initiatives and priorities.

We see the next few years as a time of great potential change. The state and national economies are currently in flux with some signs pointing to recovery and some suggesting continued decline in the ability of our government to fund higher education.

Regardless of whether changes occur, we must still be unambiguous and vocal in stating your goals for this University. Your responses in the survey will assist in convincing the administration, either the current one or a succeeding one, that your vision for Binghamton's future must be realized. Your participation will guide this campus.

And the issue is not just loss of natural areas and their attendant wildlife, but also the increase in impermeable surface, which causes more oil-polluted runoff into the Susquehanna and less recharge of the groundwater aquifers upon which this valley depends.

Of course we need parking for those who must drive to and from campus, and parking at peak times does seem to be "tighter" this year than ever. Even so, we currently have more parking spaces closer to popular destinations than most university campuses, as documented by recent consultants and as a visit to most other campuses will confirm. Besides, the University is tucking in a few more new parking lots behind the West and East Gyms.

Our University was conceived as a suburban campus just after World War II, and consequently bus, pedestrian, and bicycle access were never given much priority. However, there are some alternatives.

We do have pretty good bus service from Broome County Transit and Off-Campus College Transport. At least for BCT (I know less about OCCT, because as a faculty member I am not entitled to ride it), service is reliable and surprisingly frequent, considering how underutilized the buses are during most times of the day.

What about a contract with BCT, analogous to that negotiated for the students, where staff and faculty could ride BCT just by presenting a valid University ID? Or a provision for faculty and staff to ride OCCT? Of course many faculty and staff do not live close to a bus line. That may be unavoidable, but if a move is imminent, consider a move to a spot within reach of a bus route.

Bicycles are viewed in our culture mainly as toys, but of course they are an efficient means of transport in much of the rest of the world.

They obviously save environmentally in a number of ways beyond saving more land from car-parking lots. Bicycling and walking also provide an efficient way to get a modicum of daily exercise, not to mention a little contact with and enjoyment of the outdoors. Off-season travel is possible for all but a few weeks in the winter, and many routes are quite safe for bicycle travel.

Would it surprise you to learn that there is a part of the state Dept. of Transportation (and a person) whose main job is to improve bicycle and pedestrian traffic in the Binghamton area? Those of us who bicycle can see a steady improve-

ment for bicycles and pedestrians in the design of urban streets and rural roads. The State DOT has even floated the idea of building a special pedestrian/bicycle bridge over the Susquehanna, connecting the University directly with Riverside Drive in Johnson City. Yes, it wouldn't get much use in the dead of winter, but that season is going to get significantly shorter as global warming accelerates.

For the parking that is necessary, the University could build multi-level parking structures, instead of vast open lots. The planners always argue that such structures must pay for themselves and that is much too expensive. Why can't they include those costs as part of plans to build new structures, like the Events Center? It will cost more in the short term, but can we never think in the longer term?

And that brings me to the final point: the University should be a leader in environmental matters, not a follower. Chesapeake Bay, where the Susquehanna ends up, is stifling under the load of pollutants carried into it by excessive runoff. There is a major governmental and non-governmental effort to clean it up - we

continued on page 5



Bothered by Workload Creep? Contact the BU Chapter

by Jim Dix and Fran Goldman

Does it seem as though we're working more at our jobs than we did a few years back? Hard data is difficult to come by, but it sure looks that way. It seems as though there are more students, the same number or fewer people to serve these students, and fewer dollars to go around. As the Red Queen said, "... it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that!"

What does UUP have to say about how fast we are obliged to run? The short answer is that we should not run faster or longer without additional consideration. If the state wants us to run faster and longer, it has to give us something in return.

The long answer is, well, longer. Our contract with the state does not address workload. Instead, workload issues are governed by labor law. Since (whether we like it or not) we are state employees, we and the state are bound by what is known as the Taylor Law. The Public Employees Relations Board (PERB) was set up as an independent agency to administer the Taylor Law, and the rul-

Parking in the Woodlands

continued from page 4

should do our share, not our little bit to make it worse.

Furthermore, it's pretty clear that even before petroleum supplies give out, which geologists forecast is not very far in the future, gasoline prices will go up and probably do so quite sharply. Do any of you remember what happened when gasoline prices increased sharply in the early 1970s? It's going to change the whole transportation picture, and we will regret having cut trees – which would also have helped prevent further global warming – to create vacant parking lots. And don't forget that it takes close to a century to grow a mature forest, but only a few days to destroy it.

Contract and 'past practice' keys to defining workload

ings of PERB over the years have established a case history from which we can divine workload policies.

Although the case law from PERB is complex and subject to further interpretation, a few key findings are clear. For faculty, the workload is divided into four areas: research, teaching, university service, and other duties and responsibilities required of the employee.

For professionals, workload is defined by the parameters of their Performance Program. PERB rulings, as well as understandings between UUP and the state, have clearly stated that university administrators can adjust the mix of these duties and responsibilities, but cannot unilaterally increase total workload. The state has to negotiate with UUP for any increase in workload. UUP cannot negotiate to force BU to have smaller class size, but it can negotiate the impact of larger class size on us, its members.

Just what constitutes a full workload? For professional staff, as noted above, it is the Performance Program that delineates ones duties and responsibilities and thus the workload. However, as with academic faculty, due to the changes in the University's work environment, the duties and responsibilities of most professional employees have substantially increased over time. In such instances these increases should become a permanent part of the performance program, which might very well necessitate an increase in salary, promotion or both.

For academic faculty, the situation is more complex. Academics do not have a performance program. In arbitrating academic workload cases, PERB has often relied on agreements

between the state and UUP, as well as between administrators and faculty. PERB also relies on "past practice." At Binghamton, in the *Handbook for Faculty and Professional Staff*, there is this 30-year-old statement on the teaching component of workload: "3 undergraduate courses per semester; or 2 graduate courses per semester; or 1 undergraduate course and 1 graduate course per semester, with the expectation that there would also be substantial research, professional or service activity, and supervision of dissertations and theses. It is understood that this definition of normal load may be influenced by other considerations, and that there may be considerable variation among disciplines."

If UUP were to bring an improper practice charge against the state for an increase in workload here, PERB would use the Handbook statement, with its vague "other considerations" words, along with what the actual faculty workload has been in the past three to five years, to determine if the state has unilaterally increased total workload.

It is this past practice that we need to be careful of. Suppose, for example, that we are asked by the administration to increase our total workload to maintain the quality of education here at BU in the face of increasing enrollment and declining resources. If we do not (1) document the increase in writing; and (2) agree that the increase is voluntary and temporary; and (3) seek additional consideration for the work, then the workload increase becomes part of our past practice. It would be difficult in this case for UUP to argue that the extra work would be a unilateral increase in total workload.

A group of us on the Chapter Executive Board is looking into workload issues here; in particular, we are examining what has been the de facto workload for the past 5-10 years. If you would like to contribute to this effort, contact Jim Dix at dix@binghamton.edu

From the Vice President for Academics

What Kind of School Are We?

by James A. Dix
Chemistry Department

"We are no longer the school we think we are." Thus spake Dean Mileur when he came to talk to us in the Chemistry Department earlier this semester. That quote has been haunting me for some time. What is the school we think we are, why are we no longer that school, and what school are we becoming?

I came to Binghamton in 1981 on the strength of Binghamton's reputation as a high quality undergraduate teaching institution with a respectable graduate research component. There's no question that that is our reputation outside Binghamton: "a strong undergraduate school plus," as an outside colleague recently put it. For those of us who have been here for 20-plus years, we probably still think that is the kind of school we are.

Are we no longer the school we think we are? There are certain requirements to maintain high quality undergraduate instruction and a respectable graduate research program, not the least of which are adequate resources. The number of undergraduates enrolled at BU has been steadily increasing over the last 10 years (on the order of 15%), yet the number of full-time faculty has remained at about 500. Just to keep up with the increase in enrollment, we should have 575 full-time faculty by now.

Graduate student headcount enrollment has remained constant, but the graduate full-time-equivalents (which normalizes for part-time and full-time graduate students) has increased by 20%. If maintenance of quality of undergraduate and graduate education depends on increasing full-time faculty in tandem with increasing enrollment, then we have not maintained quality, and we are no longer the school we think we are.

One can make similar arguments with other resources. The state has reduced by approximately half the amount of money it gives SUNY; the increase in tuition dollars has not kept up with the reduction in state funds. More students, same number of faculty, fewer dollars: can one really argue, as BU administrators do, that we can maintain the quality of undergraduate and graduate programs? The more I think about it, the more I agree with Dean Mileur: Binghamton University is no longer the school that I think it is (or was).

So what kind of school are we becoming? It's clear that we are putting more emphasis on the graduate program. In a zero-sum game, or a situation of declining resources like we are in now, a shift to the graduate



program means a shift away from the undergraduate program. As is explained in a separate article in this newsletter, UUP protects us from the state unilaterally increasing workload, so the shift in workload toward the graduate program without renegotiation necessarily means a shift away from the undergraduate program to maintain our full-time professional obligation. It's not yet clear how Binghamton's change in emphasis to the graduate program will pan out.

The reasons for the change in BU are not entirely clear. However, have you, as I, felt left out of the decision-making process on this campus? The local chapter of UUP is addressing this issue with a survey of its members, due out early next semester, probing the question, what kind of university do we want Binghamton to be 5 to 10 years from now? With a respectable return rate on this survey, we should be able to make our voice heard, and make this university become the kind of school we want it to become.

Politics vs. Academics: What Do Presidential Changes Mean for SUNY?

by Darryl M. Wood

SUNY Buffalo has announced a new campus president and SUNY Albany's president has just resigned. What does this say about the politicization of SUNY? As a preface, it should be noted that a number of new presidents at four year colleges have been announced recently with mixed attitudes regarding how honest the search processes were – compare New Paltz's process to Cortland's.

John B. Simpson, Ph.D., will take office as UB's 14th president, effective January 1. Most recently, he was executive vice chancellor and provost of the University of California, Santa Cruz. This change came about after the former president announced his resignation early this year. A search committee, directed by their local council and composed of campus and community members, made their recommendation to the chancellor. From various accounts, the community members and the campus members of the

continued on page 7

Presidential Changes

continued from page 6

search committee made it clear they wanted a true academic, not a political appointment. It appears they were successful.

Karen Hitchcock announced her resignation at an emotional meeting in late October. This came after a 26-2 vote in Albany's faculty senate supporting her. It also came after a long series of rumors that she had clashed with various members of SUNY Central and the governor's office. New York State Assembly Higher Education Committee Chair Ron Canestrari is reported to be considering investigating what really happened.

Reasons for the resignation center on the Nanotechnology Center recently announced and its relation to the campus. Concerns were expressed that control over this research center was passing to another entity, not the campus. The real reasons for Hitchcock's resignation may never be made public, but it appears clear politics played a significant role.

Which of these two stories is the true indication of where SUNY is? What does this tell us about our own future? What will we do if faced with similar choices?

University-Wide Benefits Fair

UUP is again co-sponsoring the University Wide Benefits Fair on Thursday, December 4, 10 a.m. till 2 p.m. in the University Union Mandela Room. Health insurance, retirement/investment vendors, campus offices and local businesses will be participating. Door prizes will be distributed.

This is your opportunity to question the health insurance vendors regarding both cost and program changes to their offerings as well as get valuable discounts to local businesses. Further information will be forthcoming.

UUP Recognizes Chemist's Scholarship



UUP Chapter President Darryl Wood gave Sadik a plaque in recognition of her lecture.

Omowunmi A. Sadik, associate professor of chemistry, presented "Intelligent Chemical and Biological Sensors: From Cancer Detection to Bioterrorism Applications" at the Harpur College Dean's Distinguished Lecture, a UUP co-sponsored event, October 22. Sadik explained her patented innovations in chemical and biosensors technologies and how they detect the presence and/or quantity of organic vapors, toxins, metals, nucleic acids and proteins. (IH)

System-Wide Assessment

continued from page 3

tion confirming support for campus-based assessment, rejecting the approach trustees' resolution, and asking that further discussions take place. The details of this resolution are included in a report I have posted on BU's Senate web page (<<http://facultysenate.binghamton.edu/>>).

The Academic Standards Committee of the Board of Trustees met two days after the UFS passed its resolution. Associate Provost Donald Steven, who had chaired the discussion group, described the concerns of the faculty that led to the UFS and Faculty Council resolutions.

Three of the four trustees in attendance agreed that there should be a pause in implementing the June resolution in order to discuss a compromise with the faculty (de Russy, who chairs that committee, was, of course, against this notion). At the Board of Trustees meeting the following day (October 28), de Russy spoke in favor of urgent progress on system-wide assessment and against a pause in implementation of the June resolution. Board Chairman Thomas Egan allowed some discussion, but responded by saying "the Board has voted" and would be looking forward to the chancellor's progress report.

Where do we stand now? Are you

still reading? And should we care? We have these resolutions, and it would seem the board is not unanimous in its position. The chancellor agreed in a meeting with the governance leaders that the UFS and Faculty Council would be given the opportunity to develop a campus-based approach to the accountability aspect of assessment. He went on to say that if he can support our plan, a procedure will be developed to allow this to happen.

The ball would appear to be back in our court to demonstrate what we've said all along – that campus-based assessment is all that is needed or desired. I suggest we should care for at least three reasons

- any system-wide testing would be costly and take away from other funding for SUNY
- there would ultimately be pressure to "teach to the test," playing directly to those who seek uniform curricula, and
- any "value-added" testing would impose undue burdens on a student population already meeting our academic expectations.

And need we look beyond the current problems with the Regents exams to appreciate the severe limitations in standardizing testing and assessment?

Who Is This Woman and Why Would She Want to Do This?

continued from page 1

pendently wealthy – or at least supported – and is active on quite a few boards/organizations (mostly right-wing as far as I can tell).

She is a no-holds-barred conservative/education reformer who publishes widely and often controversially. Her views are quite forthright – unlike the near invisibility of the views on education of the chancellor and the other trustees. For example, in a recent article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, she has argued that professors played a critical and possibly major role in the recent scandals of affecting the management of financial institutions and corporate governance. The professor is “... a gatekeeper, determining a student’s first exposure to ethical standards;” continuing, she notes, “many have documented cases of irresponsible and unethical behavior within the professoriate....lateness for class, vulgarity, favoritism, improper use of funds, plagiarism, sexual liaisons with students, and, most basic, unwillingness to uphold the value of truth in teaching and research.”

Whew – what a *bad* lot. And responsible for the Enron/Arthur Andersen scandal, too!

About a year and a half ago, again in the *Chronicle*, de Russey suggested that campuses had been taken over by secularists who were engaging in massive intolerance towards “religious persons.” She maintained that until about 1975 or so the issue of “religious” tolerance was pretty well solved (tell that to those groups who were not even allowed admission to the prestige colleges in this country in that era!); but more recently intolerant secularists have made a mess of things.

The *Chronicle* published eight response letters. Seven were substantive and sharply critical of de Russey’s reasoning and unwavering adherence to her particular social/educational agenda.

She has been a trustee for about eight years, during which time the board has never fought vigorously

for appropriate funding for SUNY, despite the good economic climate of many of those years. Interestingly, she confided to me that one of her priorities for Binghamton is more funding. Where is she when we need her?

On the curricular side, she has fought vigorously for a one-size-fits-all general education core heavy on “Western and traditional” values and has regularly criticized the academic unrigor of “multicultural” efforts. Also she is currently very active in promoting an assessment of learning outcomes program – sounds to me like the rapidly failing testing programs in k-12 education. Can you see the pattern? College faculty are an untrustworthy and antireligious lot, so let’s test the crap out of the students, collect a lot of information and then see if we can make the data fit our preconceived and narrowly held ideas.

In a phone message with no possibility of callback, she told me a little of her thoughts about Binghamton. She would like to see more accountability among the faculty, more full-time faculty teaching undergraduates, more distinguished professors teaching undergraduates, and better funding and better rewarding of teaching. She also stated that she was not interested in the presidency at Binghamton.

United University Professions
Binghamton Chapter
LSG 516
Binghamton University
PO Box 6000
Binghamton, NY 13902-6000

Are rumors to the contrary then unfounded?

In my conversation with President De Fleur, the forward looking emphasis was quite different, focusing on a consolidation of campus accomplishments of the last 10 or so years and on working with a strategic planning group which, presumably, would receive advice and information from all parts of the campus.

Although she has little ultimate influence on funding for the campus, DeFleur did mention that over the past decade the Binghamton endowment had grown to be the largest in the system except for Buffalo (which had a huge head start as a private school years before joining SUNY).

How will the next president be chosen? The trustees have a procedure which allows for campus input but gives them the ultimate choice. Although a few presidential selections have been disorderly and widely criticized (Oswego, New Paltz, Old Westbury), several recent selections have been very orderly (Buffalo, Cortland).

On the other hand, just a few days ago, President Karen Hitchcock (Albany) made the surprise announcement that she would resign as of June 2004. This has been widely taken to be the result of substantial “political” interference.

Maybe New Zealand would be a nice place to live.