

Establish chronological cross-reference of major sources of input in State:

1. Division of the Budget
2. Board of Regents: State Education Department
3. SUNY Board of Trustees: Central Administration of SUNY
4. Local Campuses - materials:
 - a) Administration: from President → Dean
 - b) Faculty: from Governance → Departmental matters
 - c) Students: Undergraduate: Graduate: issues: policies: etc.
5. “Public” reaction and interests: “Public” involvement with SUSB

Chronologies

1. Pre-World War II: 18th century → 1944
 - a) International-national condition. (What happened during deliberations of Temporary Commission in 1948? What issues engaged? What compromises made? What did Regents regrettably accept? What was Dewey’s position? Centralization or decentralization?)
 - b) Statewide
 - c) Local: Long Island
 - d) Master Plan and Heald Commission Report)

2. World War II: Immediate aftermath: 1944-47, '48 and '60 (GI Bill, Veteran return). (A 10-12 year hiatus -- was earlier '48 move seen as "sufficient" to new political, demographic and education needs?)

Questions:

Has the role of the Trustees and Central Administration really been that of maintaining "balance of power." Countervailing forces put into play to stimulate or cool down a campus' ambitions and energies that upset this "balance" -- or acting according to a doctrine of "apparent equity or justice."

What really has been role of Central Administration in Albany?

1. To keep a "balance of power" in place?
2. To avoid visions above some norm set by institutions of the second or third order of achievement? (This actually appears to have been role of DOB in order to explain or justify their overall allocations to SUNY institutions in general and the University Centers in particular.)
3. To favor distribution of support based on some model of disciplinary form for such campus (Buffalo: Social Science or Biological Science; Albany: Political Science, Government; Binghamton: Humanities; Stony Brook: Physical Sciences and Mathematics.)

4. Concern with accelerated development of a new campus such as SUSB: comprehensive development -- spreads strength to all areas. S..... of development -- a threat and a costly venture to support.
5. Early resistance to Long Island or to SUSB -- grudging support and recognition of how costly investment in higher education is: what salary levels -- graduate student support: equipment cuts and: facilities
Ultimately -- cf. Pataki's moves -- leadership has to do with vision of society's future -- to anticipates its needs, and opportunity
6. Note -- Warren's comments re SUSB: concerned about SUSB rising "too quickly" Opposed to Toll's aggressive approach to building University. Could Israel with less severe the job?
7. 1970-71-- Toll sent into "exile" --? in Albany -- (after Ackerman affair) -- and after Diana brought in as "agent" of Albany -- negative publicity -
- if continued in any way would mean Toll's "job." At that meeting Vice Chancellor Bruce Dearing -- moralizing lecture and accusing Toll -- through his aggressive posture and promoting for SUSB wouldn't "let up." Helped create "immoral atmosphere" at SUSB. Stony Brook seen as piratical aggressor, etc. -
- opening up den of immortality, arrogance and almost criminal-like behavior.

Very odd preference judicious and thoughtful person. Was it the idea Dearing President at Binghamton Toll's presence at SUSB eclipsed the Binghamton - and SUSB got more than it deserved?? But no question that also a Board Trustees -- Warren's view of SUSB and Toll (and Pellegrino and Pond and others) conformed to this image? Worth speculating -- whether Boyer did not restructure Central Administration to help "put Stony Brook in its place"?? Became for academic and planning purposes one of 20 more odd districts rather than 1 of 4!! Why in 1975 crisis did not SUNY favor reduction of mandate as comprehensive University Center for Albany and Binghamton?? In fact, faculty of Binghamton jealously guarded its reputation for quality and excellence in undergraduate education -- and would not when priorities were forced to faced in 1975 crisis surrender their view of Binghamton and helped final revolt against Norman Cantor and eventually force him from Binghamton!! Whereas SUSB would not compromise stardom or sacrifice of its strength and commitment to graduate education, research and national recognition in New York's!! So Graduate Council and academic administration -- SED review -- and took initiative in "weaker" areas of University -- e. g. foreign languages and literature (Germanic-Slavic and Hispanic) to take action that campus took -- Ph.D. program on "hold" - not admissions into program until changes in

..... by their senior faculty could be sensed. In Hispanic Language and Literature -- agreed that “..... committee” -- actually running affairs of department “x” i.e. recruitment of faculty, students, and changes in curriculum and hiring of new key senior persons from Johns Hopkins -- did campus faculty, Graduate Council or academic administration agree to
..... to its Ph. D. program.

This also ties in with SUSB’s refusal to become *amicus curiae* or of Albany’s and SUNY’s support of Albany’s challenge to Commissioner of Education and the Regents in their to doctoral programs after academic review across all disciplines and among all universities public and private!!! to understand SUNY’s position or its reputation being affected negatively, especially within academia. Or was this meant to open a major college to the Regents and if so, boxed in that additional that had occurred since 1948? If anything, the procedure laid down by the Chancellor or SED for the doctoral review was a model of “objectivity” and helped too many and universities in New York State public and private!! If SUSB and Rochester and Cornell stand out in terms of strength ofor, than why bother with that? Did not Albany’s action (SUNY’s) in effect tend to and disrepute the

positive review of the SED and thereby minimize what was, in effect, a superb for SUSB after only about a decade after establishing its first Ph. D. program? In what way did Central Administration -- the Board of Trustees -- exhibit the same accomplishment, and enthusiasm that was appropriate and fitting? Instead -- what emerged was “sour grapes” in defending weaker programs and apparent defense of mediocrity -- was SUNY more comfortable at this point in time to a “so-so” -- willing to accept lowering of standards as of SUNY? If not, then where was the “.....?” -- where was the insistence from the Chancellor to demand that SUNY raise its level of achievements and not settle for second best??

This in effect has had to force out into the open the entire issue of the value, need and intellectual justification for SUNY Central. If anything one might argue that a steady decline in attention to the serious role on the part of the Trustees and Central Administration seems endemic; both successive choices of Chancellors for the system; both increasing restraints of the Trustees with respect to dynamic conditions facing its varied and different campuses; by the “bottleneck” of Central Administration that is neither fish nor fowl -- acting neither as an effective referee nor an effective spokesman and certainly not a creative force to help enforce the system and campuses with renewed energies and imagination. Only in a few instances would there exist a need for SUNY Central to act upon some basic issues. One was with the concern over development of the arts throughout SUNY especially in campuses or communities that could not develop these on their own. In search for Chancellors there appears to be on the part of the Trustees a willingness to forgo national recognition and competition with the established leaders of public higher education. This lack of competition or concern with recognition has not reassured the educational or public worlds of the high priority that SUNY’s leaders are giving to excellence. What major policy statements have emerged from the Trustees giving a central role to an outstanding system of public higher education in terms of what it can do for the State’s economic, social, scientific and technological development? (cf. the remarks of John McGuire after

leaving SUNY for Claremont College in California, “the tendency of SUNY has been to appoint former deans as presidents of campuses.”) The point being that the general culture surrounding deans, who by virtue of their positions or authority essentially have the duty to carry out the administrative decisions of president, vice presidents and provosts. Therefore, by definition, one could anticipate that they would logically follow the wishes of others and their effectiveness measured by their ability to carry out these plans and policies laid down by others. Here at SUNY their superiors become central administrators, Trustees and the Division of the Budget. The earlier generation of aggressive leaders being replaced by a newer generation of compliant and less aggressive and more accommodating coworkers with Central Administration. SUNY Central, once having found such persons, are not eager to effect early replacement of them. The principle of discomfiture to Central Administration may well be a major measure of the struggle between acceptance of mediocrity and the excellence that must be coexisting with universities. Do private universities exhibit the same conundrum? Not necessarily. No super bureaucracy generally faces them. The Trustees or Governors of the Boards are in more direct and constant touch with the intellectual values and needs of a campus and to what extent they are being accomplished or not. In effect, a clearer relationship exists between quality efforts of faculty and students and the ability to raise money.

Yet state systems in California, Michigan, Minnesota, Illinois, etc., appear to have succeeded. Partly is it not due to the absence of an overburdensome central bureaucracy? Is it not connected also with the constitutional autonomy of their universities? Is it not the fact that universities are treated *qua* universities and not as state agencies? But most important, do not the separate university entities enjoy an intellectual autonomy of a sort not really encountered in SUNY? In other words, in SUNY there is no real governing board. The Councils are an exercise in futility that represent impotence *vis á vis* the campuses they presently “represent.” The Board of Trustees cover all institutions under SUNY aegis. No identification, loyalty or sustained interest in any one or a number of the campuses is possible by the Board. And the Chancellor is in an even less effective position having to act as the buffer between all the campuses, the Division of the Budget and the Legislature; as well as between the Trustees and the presidents. In effect the Chancellor is not a proponent or effective spokesman for any campus *per se* but a juggler of political hot potatoes standing between all parties, but not representing in himself any one clear cut policy point of view.

The SUNY system has created the illusion that SUNY Central is basically just one big campus. It attempts to imitate a typical campus with vice presidents imitating the roles of vice presidents or provosts; and deputy vice chancellors of deans, etc. This was Boyer’s major administrative error in changing Gould’s

arrangement whereby Central Administration and the Chancellor were seen to serve the different institutional needs and objectives of the different types of institutions in SUNY -- universities, four-year colleges, community colleges, contract colleges, health science centers, etc. In addition, it empowered Central Administration to believe that it could act on behalf of all institutions since it mirrored the various offices and functions of those campuses.

HSTCHRNO.DOC
5/31/2007