As this was my first Plenary session, I found it at times to be overwhelming in the amount of information presented. The following is a synopsis of the events that occurred at the meeting.

**Thursday, October 25th**
Once arriving on campus, new senators attended a Senator Orientation session. This session provided an overview of how the actual Plenary would be run, what we could expect, and what our role was. We also learned about the history and the role of the SUNY Faculty Senate in the governance of SUNY.

**Friday, October 26th**
Early in the morning we heard various reports from the Executive Committee and the President’s report. Both reports talked extensively about the concern many smaller SUNY campuses have about the implementation of the new Resource Allocation Model (RAM for short). This is the formula by which the state support (roughly $790 million) is divided up and distributed to 29 state operated campuses across the system. This new model was designed to create a allocation model that better reflected the needs of campuses, and at the same time allow for a stable model that will allow campuses to plan 5 years in advance. Prior to this most campuses could not plan further than 6 months in advance. The new model is up to date data driven and is based on a “fair share” approach: State Support is distributed equitably based on discipline and level mix while accounting for variance in tuition revenue by level. It works hand in hand with Rational Tuition & Maintenance of Effort to provide an opportunity for predictability and planning on all campuses. The President of the SUNY Senate, Kenneth O’Brien, stated in his report that there would be winners and losers of this plan; where the winners would be the university centers like the University at Buffalo.

After these reports, we then met in our sector sessions. Sector sessions are like-campuses across the state. For the University at Buffalo, we are considered a University Center and met with the other University Center SUNY Senators. Other University Centers included the University of Binghamton, University at Albany, and Stony Brook. This meeting gave the University Center representatives the time to update each other of current events on their campuses, as well as discuss questions the University Centers have to the Chancellor who would be at the meeting later in the day. Again, the discussion evolved to the Resource Allocation Model as well as common interests of the funding of Undergraduate Research, Private/Public business relationships, and the weight of online/electronic faculty publications in the tenure process.
In the afternoon, the entire SUNY Faculty Senate received reports from the SUNY Retirees Service Corp., the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, and the SUNY Student Assembly. These reports can be found on the SUNY Faculty Senate webpage at http://www.suny.edu/facultySenate.

There were three main reports that occurred in the afternoon that I’d like to focus on in my report to you.

**Provost’s Office Report – David Lavallee, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost**

Dr. Lavallee presented on the topic of Student Mobility. This has been another issue of concern among the SUNY Campuses. In an effort to improve Student Mobility, the Office of the Provost has been charged with developing a policy that make SUNY the most transfer friendly higher education system in the country. Lavallee cited national statistics the most prevalent destination for transfer students is two year public institutions. In other words, transfer students are transferring between two year institutions more than they are transferring between two year and four year institutions.

They are seeing similar patterns within SUNY. For all students who earned an undergraduate degree in 2010-2011, 46.4% of baccalaureate degrees; and $27.1% of associate degrees were awarded to transfer students. On a semester by semester basis, among all students who transferred to SUNY campuses 47.6% went to SUNY Community Colleges and 52.3% went to SUNY State Ops.
Understanding this data we see that transfer is everyone’s business. As a system, there is a need to support omnidirectional transfer student success. There is a basis for seamless transfer. All SUNY A.A. and A.S. graduates will be guaranteed:

- Transfer of at least 60 credits of coursework toward the bachelor’s degree
- Up to 30 credits of general education courses in ten subject areas
- No repeat courses with the same (at least 70%) content
- Transfer to at least one SUNY 4-year campus

SUNY Policies are making seamless transfer work – Beyond General Education

Major Requirements in the first two years:

- 37 transfer Paths (58 majors) in the most popular disciplines
  - Covers 95% of all transfer students within SUNY

- 140 core courses defined by faculty committees
  - Over 400 faculty from both 2 year + 4 year campuses

- Nearly 15,000 courses in the mobility database

These courses are guaranteed to transfer to SUNY campuses.

For more information on Student Mobility, contact information is:

**Academic Affairs**
David Lavallee
Provost
David.lavallee@suny.edu
518-320-1251

Provost Student Mobility Page: [http://www.suny.edu/provost/academic_affairs/studentmobility](http://www.suny.edu/provost/academic_affairs/studentmobility)

**Student Mobility**
Dan Knox
Student Mobility Project Coordinator
Daniel.knox@suny.edu
518-320-1155

Student Mobility Page: [https://www.suny.edu/student/transfer.cfm](https://www.suny.edu/student/transfer.cfm)
**Degreeworks**
Dave DeMarco
Information Technology: Degreeworks Project Manager
Dave.demarco@suny.edu
518-320-1317

Confluence site for Degreeworks: https://confluence.itec.suny.edu/confluence

**SUNY Finance Report – Brian Hutzley, Vice Chancellor for Financial Services and Chief Financial Officer**

Mr. Hutzley reported on the implementation of the SUNY Resource Allocation Model. There will be $787.2 Million to allocate to SUNY Campuses. With this allocation, SUNY felt it was necessary to have a new allocation tool for the following reasons:

- SUNY’s current method of allocating funds is broken
  - Two of the major components are outdated: specifically cost of instruction and enrollment levels
  - Distribution of cuts was not done consistently. Creating allocations that did not address strategy, mission, or enrollment changes over time.
- Limited resources must be allocated to meet the instructional needs while acknowledging SUNY’s unique composition and broad missions
- Establishing an intelligent tool for allocating funding will ensure SUNY is nimble and able to adapt and excel in the face of a changing educational and fiscal environment.
- The prior tool is outdated and used many assumptions:
  - Based on SUNY-centric direct instructional expenditures
  - Old cost data had been estimated, prorated and factored down and did not align with true cost of instruction
  - Costs were set in 2003 and were not differentiated between sectors
  - Overall costs in higher education have increased by 29 percent since 2003
    - Low cost discipline types in the lower division area such as Business were valued at $1.706/FTE, versus $4,075/FTE in the new tool
  - Funded enrollment frozen at 2007-08 levels
    - 8 percent enrollment growth: 187,427 AAFTE versus 172,628 AAFTE
  - Provided funding for centers and institutions that no longer exist

There is a need for a better model that optimized the system’s limited resources, that is responsive to strategic goals, acknowledges campus differences, is sensitive to each campus (and to campus retention of tuition), is rational and data driven, and is predictable and useful for longer term planning.
The new model components consist of:
- Cost/Enrollment
- Research
- Academic Mission Adjustments
- Geographic Differential

This new tool is different than the old model in that is is:
- Data Driven:
  - Adopts nationally normalized, up to date external costs
  - Based on a “fair share” approach: State support distributed equitably based on discipline & level mix while accounting for variance in tuition revenue by level
  - Works hand in hand with Rational Tuition & Maintenance of Effort to provide an opportunity for predictability and planning
  - New tool enhances focus on enrollment & costs as main drivers of allocation
  - Moves away from various distributions used from 2008-09 through 2011-12 that did not recognize mission, strategy, or enrollment changes
  - Geographic costs differences are still acknowledged but are now base on accurate, contractual based costs
  - Mission Adjustment, which are based on Academic Mission, are included in the Enrollment/Cost Component
  - Small Campus Adjustments are eliminated:
    - As directed, many campus have driven efficiencies and enrollment improvement eliminating the need
    - Transition funding available to support campuses over a three year period
    - Shared Service will provide additional offsets as planned

Mr. Hutzley then reported supporting data for the need to change in the age of enrollment data, and the impact of reductions that occurred 2007-08.

The implementation of the new tool is as follows:
- 2012-13: Transition and planning – no impact
- 2013-14: 30% to total impact
- 2014-15: Additional 30% of total impact
- 2015-16: Remaining 40% of total impact
- 2016-17: 100% implementation
## Effects of the New Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>New Tool Impact</th>
<th>Mitigating Impact*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Centers/Other</td>
<td>• Overall Increase in State</td>
<td>Transitional Funding to Be Provided or Received in Years 1-3; Additional Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>Support of 1.8% ($10 M)</td>
<td>Options for Downstate to be Explored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o 3 campuses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Largest increase of 11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decreases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o 5 Campuses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Largest decrease of 18.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>• Overall Decreases in State</td>
<td>Transitional Funding to Be Provided in Years 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support of -4.0% ($7.1 M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o 3 campuses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Largest increase of 5.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decreases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o 10 campuses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Largest decrease of 21.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>• Overall Decreases in State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support of -4.3% ($2.7 M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o 3 campuses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Largest increase of 13.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Decreases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o 5 campuses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Largest decrease of 27.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact & Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Downward Adjustments</td>
<td>$(4.2 \text{ M})</td>
<td>$(12.3\text{ M})</td>
<td>$(22.7\text{ M})</td>
<td>$(24.0\text{ M})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Upward Adjustments</td>
<td>$4.2 \text{ M}</td>
<td>$12.3\text{ M}</td>
<td>$22.7\text{ M}</td>
<td>$24.0\text{ M}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Hutzley talked about the ability for campuses to receive transitional funding. Campuses that want to request the funding must provide short term and long term plans to ensure campuses are able to work towards a fiscally viable position: Getting everyone on their bottom line. Campuses will submit plans demonstrating need and use of funds. The transitional funding is not a permanent adjustment; it will be phased out over implementation period.

The Transitional Funding Recommendation he put forward include:

- Available to only certain campuses based on Mission Review Meeting (Academics, Finance, Operations)
- Additional support through the SUNY loan process/policy as needed requested: The support is out of the tool.
- Transition funds require an investment and improvement plan
  - Funding to be used for driving improvements, addressing the issues
  - Regular meetings, discussions and updates
- System-wide support to address broader issues will also be required:
  - Recruiting & Marketing
  - Enrollment & Program Support
  - Retention & Student Success
  - Transfer Programs & Partnerships
  - Shared Services & Investments in Savings

**Sector Reports with Chancellor Nancy Zimpher**

Each SUNY Sector was to report on their sectors, as well as provide three questions to the Chancellor. The University sectors inquired about research funding for undergraduate students, protections to ensure that private/public partnerships are transparent, and concern about the need to better recognize electronic publication by faculty in the tenure process. The Chancellor was not aware of the previous funding for undergraduate research, but expressed hope that she could ask for funding for this from the state as this would easily fall within the research component of SUNY. As for private/public partnerships, she could not agree more with the need for transparency and the need for integrity. These relationships are on a case by case basis and she felt the details will be resolved in the negotiations. Finally, she also agreed that electronic publications should be reviewed for the tenure process.
Saturday, October 27th

The Senate reviewed and passed three resolutions. They were:

- **Support of Downstate Medical Center**
  A resolution to support the current Board of Trustees actions to support the Downstate Medical Center that is currently undergoing significant financial challenges, due in large part to its provision of medical services to a population that includes a large proportion of the indigent and underinsured, changing reimbursement rates for government programs, and a failure by the state to maintain its support.

- **Necessity for Campus Presidents**
  A resolution to support that each SUNY campus have its own president to pursue academic excellence and conduct external relations/fundraising. “Systemness” in the concept of campuses sharing presidents has been questioned by Middle States and reports filed by the three campus alliances provide no support for the principle.

- **Need for Transitional Funding with the New Resource Allocation Tool**
  This resolution supported the need for transitional funding beyond the three year implementation period for campuses that showed the need for such funding.

SUNY Committee Reports were also given and can be seen at the Faculty Senate Web Site at: [http://www.suny.edu/facultySenate/](http://www.suny.edu/facultySenate/) Committee reports were received from the following Committees:

- Committee on Diversity and Cultural Competence
- Committee on Ethics and Institutional Integrity
- Programs and Awards
- Student Life
- Governance
  - Two Bylaw changes were proposed
    - Electronic Meetings – how they were handled
    - Executive Committee Expansion – allowing non-elected SUNY Faculty members (committee chairs) to attend meetings

- Graduate and Research
- Undergraduate
- Operations