Chapter 2: Mission and Goals; Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

From its many new academic programs to its many new facilities and record level of research funding, the University at Albany has transformed itself in significant ways since 2000, and UAlbany’s mission and goals have guided the process.

However, as the recently developed Going Forward Plan\(^1\) states, it is time for the University to “create an updated statement of mission and vision,” and “determine University priorities on the basis of core strengths and elements of the University mission/vision and create a plan to foster those priorities.” It adds: “While our leadership over the past several years has provided wise stewardship and promoted new development, and while we have sustained an ever-rising trajectory of accomplishments, our actions have lacked a set of consensually derived priorities and directions.”

The changes both in the presidency and other leadership positions, as noted in the introductory self-study chapter, have clearly had an impact across the University, including on goal-setting, planning, implementation and assessment processes. This is an important feature of the context under which UAlbany has been operating for the past five years and worth underscoring. This self-study chapter details the impact of leadership changes on how UAlbany has complied with Standard 1: Mission and Goals, and Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal.

Based on this self-study review, a key recommendation is that UAlbany’s new leadership team engage the entire community to update the University’s mission and strategically plan to address the challenges ahead. This recommendation is currently being implemented.

Overview


With the exception of the 2006 Draft University Goals and Priorities, the documents were developed with the participation of a cross-section of the University community, and, in varying degrees, all have been disseminated and used to guide University actions.

\(^{1}\) http://www.albany.edu/academics/files/Going%20Forward%20Plan%20Final%20Draft%201-12-09.pdf
The 1992 Mission Statement influenced the development of the 1998 Statement of Strategic Values and Goals, and that statement served as a framework for actions during the subsequent six years of former President Karen Hitchcock’s tenure. Both were broadly disseminated at the time, primarily as print documents. Tenets of these documents influenced subsequent campus-wide planning efforts, such as the 1998 Facilities Master Plan, which defined campus facilities goals and charted priority construction and development over the following 10-year period to the present.

The 2006 Draft University Goals and Priorities were a new articulation of goals developed by Kermit Hall after he became president. This document officially remains a “draft” due to Dr. Hall’s passing before the document could be shaped into a final version. But it was used to guide University planning processes during his tenure and remains accessible to the entire UAlbany community on the University’s Website.

The most up-to-date and comprehensive articulation of goals is contained in the 2006 SUNY Mission Review II document, a “Memorandum of Understanding” between the UAlbany campus and State University of New York system administration, which thus reflects the SUNY system administration influence, as well. The development of this document involved many faculty and staff at the University, as well as SUNY system administration staff, but it was not widely disseminated when completed at the beginning of the lengthy transitional period that followed President Hall’s death. Of the four key documents, it is the only one that includes metrics for gauging the achievement of stated goals.

It is not surprising that the manner in which these documents have been implemented has been determined by University leadership and the environment in which the University is operating.

**1992 Mission Statement**

The 1992 Mission Statement was developed through a 33-member taskforce of faculty, staff and student leaders, along with a hearing process initiated in November 1991 by then President Patrick Swygert.

The taskforce drafted a statement which was sent out to all parties on campus. In February of 1992, there were three campus-wide hearings as well as meetings with Central Council, the Student Association, the University Senate and Executive Committee. The taskforce also received correspondence from emeriti faculty, alumni, and other members of the campus community. Five formal motions were drafted as a result of this input and adopted into the mission statement. In March of 1992, President Swygert distributed the final report of the taskforce along with the finalized Mission Statement.

The 1992 Mission Statement defined the University as characterized by five qualities:

---

4 The Master Plan report involved six broadly constituted campus committees and was distributed as a print document.
“First, a commitment to the pursuit and advancement of knowledge, for its own sake and for its practical benefits to society

“Second, a commitment to the teaching of students, to their growth in knowledge, and to that reinforcement of character, through co-curricular experiences, which enables them to develop emotionally, physically and socially, even as they mature intellectually

“Third, a commitment to the larger interests of society through acts of public service and by fostering the ideals of social justice

“Fourth, a commitment to freedom of thought, inquiry and expression, and to the rights and obligations of faculty and students to pursue knowledge, wherever it may lead

“Fifth, a commitment to profit intellectually and imaginatively from differences of opinion and culture”

In addition to stating those key characteristics of UAlbany’s mission, the document also includes considerable additional elaboration.

It notes that:

“The modern University at Albany emphasizes the integration of teaching, research, creative expression and public service in its undergraduate, graduate and professional programs.”

“The mission of the University at Albany continues to be that of serving as a comprehensive research university wherein graduate programs in the Arts and Sciences and the professions reinforce each other and invigorate the undergraduate experience.”

“The University considers the expansion of partnerships with academic, business, cultural, and governmental organizations throughout northeastern New York essential to the success of its educational mission.”

“The University at Albany extends its mission to serve the interests of New York by promoting the University’s capacity as a national and international center for scholarship, education and service, and by engaging in academic and professional programs, well beyond the University’s regional borders, which promote knowledge and understanding.”

While UAlbany’s mission of education, research and service is clear and central to the statement, the document does not fully capture the dimensions of UAlbany 17 years later.

In formulating an updated mission and vision statement, it is recommended that the University build on the work done for the Going Forward Plan, which puts forth as initial ideas for consideration: “incorporating both research and educational aspects of our enterprise; incorporating restoration of UAlbany as a highly selective institution; incorporating our commitment to diversity and our global reach; incorporating strategic engagement with our institutional location.”
1998 and 2006 Goals

The influence of the 1992 Mission Statement is apparent in the 1998 Statement of Strategic Values and Goals; and its key themes, which are quite general, are reflected as well in the 2006 Draft University Goals and Priorities and the 2006 Mission Review document.

Both the 1998 and 2006 statements of goals emphasize strong undergraduate and graduate programs, the pursuit of knowledge, a need to expand and diversify revenue streams, enhancement of social responsibility and engagement, and a need to fortify and promote the reputation of the University. One new item highlighted in the 2006 goals (and in the Going Forward Plan) is the development of athletic, recreational, intellectual, alumni and public relations programs to fortify University identity and spirit. The 2006 goals also place much greater emphasis on internationalization, and this priority is also reflected in the Going Forward Plan.

The 1998 “Strategic Goals,” were developed as part of a two-year strategic planning process initiated in the fall of 1996. A 34-member committee was appointed and subcommittees were formed from “a cross section of University administrators, faculty, staff and students.” The committees met with the University Senate, University Council, Student Association, and Central Council. In September of 1998, the document was submitted to President Hitchcock, and she formally approved it in October of 1998. (Charting the Future: Creating a New Learning Environment in the 21st Century (1998), p. 13).

These goals are summarized as follows:

Goal 1 - To provide a distinctive student-centered undergraduate experience that is highly competitive as result of its intellectual coherence, rigor and engagement of students with faculty in the process of inquiry and discovery

Goal 2 - To provide distinguished graduate and professional programs that reflect the distinctive strengths of its faculty and are competitive

Goal 3 - To further advance its national and international reputation as a major public research university, which competes successfully for the most qualified faculty and students and external research support, and which is committed to the advancement of knowledge for its own sake and practical benefits to society

Goal 4 - To remain committed to societal responsibility and inclusiveness

Goal 5 - To establish and stabilize enrollment comparable to peers and to increase diversity and selectivity of the student body

Goal 6 - To expand and diversify revenue sources for continued growth in the context of its mission and strategic goals

The 2006 “Draft University Goals and Priorities” were developed by President Hall after consultation with each vice president. They were also shared with the University Senate, and posted on UAlbany’s Website.
This brief document identified six goals:

- **Goal 1** - Demand excellence in intellectual achievement across the undergraduate curriculum to strengthen recruitment, retention, graduation and placement of a diverse and prepared student population
- **Goal 2** - Strengthen graduate programs and faculty in areas with potential for further international and national distinction, as measured by accepted barometers of academic and scholarly achievement
- **Goal 3** - Expand and diversify the revenues of the University by targeting private philanthropy, and a stronger flow of dollars from the federal government and for-profit corporations
- **Goal 4** - Further internationalize and diversify the composition of the student and faculty bodies and curriculum to boost the scholarly exchange of people and ideas
- **Goal 5** - Fortify University identity and spirit by developing athletic, recreational, intellectual, alumni and public relations programs
- **Goal 6** - Fully exploit the natural linkages between University, city, region and state, its peoples and its businesses, to foster economic transformation, job creation, and a social foundation built on the ideals of knowledge and discovery

**Mission Review 2006**

The 2006 SUNY Mission Review II (MRII), developed by a cross-section of faculty and staff, reflects the general themes in both the 1998 and 2006 statements of goals but provides far greater specificity about UAlbany’s plans to realize those goals.

The Memorandum of Understanding describing this agreement was developed over the course of two years. A mission summary was submitted to SUNY administration in June 2004 and, in September 2004, after consulting with the University deans and vice presidents, the first draft of the full MOU was sent to the campus community for comment. During fall 2004, there were 13 faculty meetings held on the subject and the University Senate was consulted. Through the University Planning Council, a number of comments and amendments were suggested and incorporated. In November 2006, the Memorandum of Understanding was finalized by both the University and SUNY administration.5

MRII offers an overview of what is being done to support the scholarly and creative work at the heart of the University and how the context in which the University operates, particularly the financial landscape, affects planning and development of programs. As the document states, it was developed to “provide guidance for planning the campus’s future and a framework for gauging the achievement of its goals.”

The 31-page document spells out, in considerable detail, UAlbany goals for student enrollment, increasing faculty, research funding, academic programs, student outcomes, technology,

facilities, resource management, community relations and service, and more. Citing a range of indicators, the document compares UAlbany’s position to institutions identified as its peers and aspirational peers and it highlights UAlbany’s overall economic impact on the Capital Region.

MRII calls for steadily increasing undergraduate enrollment by 1,100 students as a revenue enhancement measure, while also increasing student diversity and the proportion of students from outside New York State. The document recognizes it might be necessary to compromise somewhat on selectivity in entering-undergraduate-student academic quality in order to generate additional revenue to support the hiring of additional faculty.

MRII places great importance on increasing faculty for achieving goals. “If the University is to achieve its goals to continue the development and ascendance of its academic programs, increase sponsored funding for research, and improve students’ academic profile and graduation rates, it must make increasing its faculty its highest priority through 2010.” Retention of accomplished faculty and support for faculty development are also cited as important priorities.

UAlbany commits to ambitious and specific research achievement goals in MRII: 1) increase total sponsored research expenditures by 7% annually beginning in 07-08, and 2) increase federal funding expenditures by 6.5% annually through 2010.

In 2007-2008, UAlbany faculty attracted $392 million in research funding, an increase of 38% over the previous year, significantly surpassing the goal for overall research funding. Federal funding to UAlbany investigators increased by 2.8% in 2008 (latest year reported to the National Science Foundation), short of the ambitiously targeted 6.5% growth. However, this increase came in a year when the federal research budget declined by about the same margin.

Analyses that compare UAlbany NSF-reported research expenditures to peer institutions show that this strong research performance is due to sustained outstanding performance in the social sciences, especially public-policy-oriented social science, atmospheric sciences, and physical sciences and materials engineering. These areas reflect the historic University investment and strength in social and atmospheric sciences and the dramatic success at UAlbany in the fields of nanoscale sciences and engineering. When School of Public Health faculty who are NYS Department of Health (DOH) employees are included, UAlbany also outperforms peers in life sciences. Without DOH, the University trails peers. This reflects the fact that UAlbany is still building its life sciences faculty through the hiring of outstanding senior and junior faculty in public health sciences and in biology and chemistry.

MRII also identifies the need to modernize existing facilities. Continued investment in the East Campus, the University's University at Albany Foundation-owned biotechnology campus, is also addressed.

The $5 billion investment in the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering (CNSE) represents the most extensive facilities investments in this field anywhere in the world, as rated by peers in Small Times magazine. UAlbany has opened two state-of-the-art life sciences buildings since 2004, the Life Sciences Research Building on the Uptown Campus, and the Cancer Center on the East Campus. The National Science Foundation reported that UAlbany was
the highest performing university in the nation with respect to federally financed equipment
expenditures for research in 2005 ($54 million) and 2006 ($58 million) and the second-highest
performing university in the nation in 2007 ($39 million). This standing was driven by industry
supported infrastructure investments for the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering.
Major state and University at Albany Foundation investments also supported infrastructure
development in the life sciences in the Cancer Research Center on the East Campus.

In addition to investments in facilities, faculty hiring has been a priority for life sciences and
nanoscale sciences and engineering. Empire Innovations funding, a special SUNY science
faculty hiring initiative in 2008, allowed UAlbany to hire two cancer center faculty and four
CNSE faculty. The College of Arts and Sciences has created a new RNA Institute initiative; it
has successfully hired a director and is about to hire a second senior leader in nucleic acid mass
spectrometry. The University’s competitive Compact Planning and selective investment
processes resulted in an additional 30 faculty being added between 2006 and 2007.

The “academic directions” section of the document spells out a wide range of initiatives, both
under way and planned, to strengthen undergraduate and graduate education. Included on the
undergraduate level are the Honors College and new majors. At the graduate level, Mission
Review II cites a number of revised or expanding graduate offerings in the planning stages and
highlights the inadequacy of graduate student support allocations. It recommends investing
relatively more in doctoral assistantships at the expense of master’s assistantships.

Other academic directions include UAlbany’s commitment to internationalization, collaborative
programming with academic institutions both within New York State and internationally,
ongoing expansion of online learning options, development of a campus culture of assessment,
and responsiveness to state needs.

In terms of student outcomes, MRII sets goals for graduation and retention rates. The document
notes UAlbany’s many efforts to strengthen the quality of campus life and the University’s
pledge to continue to administer surveys of student perceptions of the campus.

The document describes planning processes and principles for both campus facilities and
technology to support UAlbany’s academic and research goals. It says the University is
committed to launching a comprehensive fundraising campaign; a critically important goal is
increasing the University’s endowment. It also says UAlbany is pursuing a number of strategies
to market itself more effectively.

“Academic excellence at all levels – faculty research, graduate training and undergraduate
education – is the goal for the University at Albany,” says MRII. One area where this committee
believes this document comes up short is in goals that focus on student learning and which give
some sense of what excellence in undergraduate education looks like.

---

6Source: National Science Foundation/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Research and
Development Expenditures at Universities and Colleges, FY2007, page 668 of report available at
Despite the absence of expressed goals, however, UAlbany does focus on student learning in the Institutional Assessment Plan, which distinguishes assessment of student learning from institutional effectiveness in other areas (i.e., research, service, public service, academic support, and administrative services). In particular, the Assessment Advisory Committee points to the 9 Principles of Good Practice for Assessing Student Learning put forward by the American Association of Higher Education Assessment Forum as principles that underlie UAlbany’s approach to assessing institutional effectiveness.

Student learning outcomes are also documented in specific materials included in regular reviews of academic programs. At the time of the development of the SUNY MRII document, each administrative unit was responsible for producing a “dashboard” of indicators that provided a snapshot of performance across a number of areas. In addition, Student Success units examined out-of-class learning and emphasized the importance of addressing the needs of the “whole student” through comprehensive and continuing assessments. These latter assessments, their progress, and ongoing plans are covered in the self-study chapters on institutional and student learning assessment, and student support services.

And, of course, one key initiative cited in MRII that focuses on student learning is the Honors College, which enrolled its first students in 2006. This program has been the subject of annual evaluations (see www.albany.edu/honorscollege). Participating students overall have a positive view of their honors courses. Characteristics of honors courses about which students gave the most positive feedback (from the most recent survey) are:

- Ongoing, meaningful discussion in class; students liked the opportunity to share and think about a range of ideas
- Professors showing obvious interest in the students’ learning and performance; students were particularly impressed when professors were willing to engage in conversations and other activities with them outside class
- Professors requiring that the students work hard and think intensely; several students noted that their best courses were those where they felt “in over their heads” initially, but with guidance from the professor felt competent by the end of the semester

In the time since the MRII document was formally adopted in November 2006, UAlbany has moved forward with many of the plans, while others have been revised or put on hold in the face of budget constraints and the extended leadership transition.

For example, efforts to increase faculty numbers have been hindered by state budget cuts. The University has been able to add some faculty positions, but not to the extent initially sought. From 2006 to 2008, the number of full-time budgeted faculty has increased by 23 from 644 to 667, and part-time from 345 to 397, rather than the 23 full-time positions per year, as originally envisioned by the Compact Planning process. In 2000, UAlbany had 593 annually budgeted full-time faculty positions and 327 part-time faculty.

Undergraduate enrollment has grown, from 12,013 in fall 2005 to 13,245 in fall 2008, a rate of growth actually slightly faster than projected in MRII. In light of state budget cuts, the
University plans to slightly reduce undergraduate enrollment in fall 2009, but will gain a more selective entering freshman class.

MRII, as well as the 1992 Mission Statement and the Going Forward Plan, underscore the University’s commitment to “enhancing the diversity of its students, staff, and faculty.”

While there has been an increase in the number of undergraduate students of color, UAlbany has a relatively small number of faculty and administrators of color. Issues around faculty diversity are fully discussed in Chapter 8, which summarizes the diversity situation by concluding: “In sum, while UAlbany’s faculty has become more diverse by race in general, efforts could be focused more on recruiting and retaining African-American and Hispanic faculty” as the relative proportion of African American and Hispanic faculty have been relatively unchanged over the course of the self-study period. With respect to advancements in being more gender diverse, Chapter 8 concludes that “the University’s efforts in recruiting and retaining women faculty in both full-time and part-time positions are showing positive trends.”

Guided more recently by UAlbany’s 2004 Institutional Assessment Plan, the University and academic units have conducted several assessments to inform decision-making in terms of student outcomes and institutional advancements.

Meanwhile, the issue of adequately funding graduate students continues to challenge the University. In 2009, UAlbany reduced the number of graduate student lines due to budget cuts. (A more complete discussion of this issue is presented in the Student Admissions and Retention chapter.)

In terms of marketing efforts, in 2008 the University launched its first-ever branding initiative, with the theme of “The World Within Reach,” to strengthen its efforts to recruit and attract quality students and faculty. The initiative is built on UAlbany’s signature characteristics: life-enhancing research and scholarship, strategic location, modern vision, diversity that enriches learning, and excellence at a great value. The message is being communicated through admissions recruitment materials, advertising, and the University’s Website.

All in all, MRII shows the many facets of UAlbany and the many efforts across the institution to advance UAlbany’s mission and goals. It is the most comprehensive document articulating UAlbany goals during the self-study period. While most of the University community never saw it, since it was not disseminated beyond a small group when completed, it has since gotten new attention from a cross-section of the UAlbany community through the Middle States process, and is now posted on the self-study wiki.

In the future, UAlbany’s new leadership team should engage the entire community in updating the University’s mission and strategic plan to address the challenges ahead. In doing so, University leadership should clearly communicate University goals and priorities, share significant documents, such as MRII, with the UAlbany community. The University should build on the work done for the Going Forward Plan, which puts forth as initial ideas for consideration, “incorporating both research and educational aspects of our enterprise; incorporating restoration of UAlbany as a highly selective institution; incorporating our commitment to diversity and our
global reach; incorporating strategic engagement with our institutional location.” The University should also consider further developing and harnessing the MyUAlbany portal to communicate information targeted to faculty and staff.

A focus on student learning also should be included in UAlbany’s strategic goals.

Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal

Just as the key documents articulating UAlbany’s mission and goals reflect changes in leadership during this re-accreditation period, so do the processes affecting planning, resource allocation, assessment and institutional renewal. In addition to changes in UAlbany’s presidency, changes in senior staff and leadership of UAlbany’s schools and colleges have also influenced the effectiveness of these processes. One result is the lack of a consistent formalized connection between the University’s mission and goals and resource allocation during the re-accreditation period. In moving forward, the University should more clearly link its goals to planning and resource allocation decisions and improve its communications about the institution’s budget.

Planning

The 1998 Statement of Strategic Values and Goals, the overarching framework for actions during former President Hitchcock’s tenure, also served as a spur and guide for many of UAlbany’s schools and colleges in the development of strategic plans.

The College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) developed a strategic plan for 2003-2008, and many of its recommendations have come to fruition, i.e., the development of an Honors College (albeit UAlbany’s Honors College is a University-wide initiative, not a CAS unit), the development of new majors in journalism, documentary studies, etc. CAS has carefully tracked progress of its initiatives, including through the Compact Planning and selective investment processes put in place by President Hall. CAS plans to convene a committee in fall 2009 to start on a new CAS strategic plan, recognizing that the selection of George Philip as president will shape such a plan moving forward.

Former School of Business Dean Richard Highfield developed a strategic plan, dated Dec. 1, 2000, and his successor Paul Leonard offered an updated version of that plan in spring 2004. The School’s new dean, Donald Siegel, held strategic planning retreats for faculty and staff in the fall and winter of 2008-2009 and has identified the top five priorities of the School: (1) resource acquisition/fund raising; (2) recruiting/retaining high-quality faculty and students; (3) building the intellectual capital of the school; (4) developing a closer connection to the business and economic development communities; and (5) rankings.

The School of Information Science and Policy strategic plan, dated July 2001, discusses trends and demands and notes that the Provost’s Advisory Committee on Information Science is considering the future of the larger “information science enterprise” at the University. The School of Information Science and Policy evolved into the College of Computing and Information, which was formally launched in fall 2005.

Former School of Education Dean Ralph Harbison submitted a progress report on the school’s strategic planning process on Nov. 28, 2000. He included a document articulating the School’s mission, vision and goals, as well as strategic planning documents for the departments of
Educational Administration and Policy Studies, Educational and Counseling Psychology, Educational Theory and Practice, and Reading. In his plan, he says he takes for granted “a fundamental prerequisite for success of both the School’s and the University’s strategic development. That is: the University at Albany will soon formulate and make operational a transparent performance-based system of internal resource allocation which will reward in a predictable and equitable fashion those behaviors by academic (and other units) that contribute directly to achievement of the University’s overarching strategic objectives.” While the University developed a variant of a responsibility-centered budgeting model in 2002-2003, it was not adopted owing to the constrained fiscal environment at the time.


The School of Public Health, led at the time by Interim Dean John Conway, submitted a strategic plan on July 8, 1999. Current Dean Philip Nasca has formed a School of Public Health Strategic Planning Committee to begin the process of developing a new plan.

The School of Criminal Justice and Rockefeller College did strategic plans in 2001. Updated plans are anticipated now that the University has a president in place.

In addition to strategic plans by schools and colleges, institutional plans for facilities and technology were also developed to support the achievement of University goals. The Facilities Master Plan is discussed below, and the Information Technology Services (ITS) division has been very proactive in planning since 2002. ITS developed a strategic plan for the 2002-05 period, used the ITS Compact Plan as its 2006-09 blueprint, and is at this writing considering campus feedback on a draft ITS plan for the 2009-12 period. In addition, ITS annually develops an operating plan; resource allocation is linked to this plan and is monitored regularly. Finally, the Office of the CIO has always included a contingency budget in its annual operating plans, and builds reserves in order to carry out major infrastructure investment projects.

In response to queries, the various non-academic administrative and service units of the institution report they have not produced strategic plans. Given UAlbany’s commitment to maintain its academic quality despite resource scarcity over the past decade, non-academic units have understandably remained focused on how to continue to deliver core services. The units, each of which is led by a vice president, include: Athletic Administration, Communications and Marketing, Finance and Business, Research, Student Success, and University Development.

Reflecting the 1998 goals calling for the expansion and diversification of revenues, a common thread in many of the college and school plans was the need to beef up fundraising efforts, as well as attract more research funds. As mentioned earlier, UAlbany has had impressive success in dramatically increasing research funding over the last decade.7

In terms of fundraising, the “BOLD.VISION.” campaign was initiated in 2003 by President Hitchcock but then suspended in 2005 by President Hall so the University could re-assess the campaign’s goals and timeline, and the campus resources needed to sustain it. MRII states that the University is committed to a comprehensive campaign, but no campaign has been launched.

7 See chart from Research Office: “Awards Administered Through the Research Foundation of SUNY.”
Also in 2005, former President Hall announced that the University would revisit its strategic planning processes through Compact Planning, and stated that the University planned to tighten the links between its planning and resource allocation processes. This effort is discussed further below in the section on resource allocation.

The record presented in this section confirms that each of the University’s academic units has made at least one significant strategic planning effort since the most recent reaccreditation. On the other hand, it is reasonable to conclude that planning at each college and school has been episodic and rather uncoordinated with planning at other units within the institution. College and school planning efforts have tended to be initiated in conjunction with dean turnover, which has been frequent. Changes in top leadership at the University, as noted in Chapter 1, have further contributed to a lack of coordination.

The University would benefit from implementation of more regular and coordinated planning activities among its units. For example, one model that the institution used prior to the 1990s is annual rolling five-year strategic plans for each unit. This practice ensures that each unit’s plan is up-to-date. With a set of plans developed in the context of common environmental assumptions, top management is better able to judge goal consonance across units on an apples-to-apples basis. A drawback of rolling plans is that each year’s plan is typically keyed off the previous year’s plan, possibly leading to a status quo bias. Rolling plans are best accompanied by a fresh examination of goals and constraints and the overhaul of the plan at regular but less frequent intervals. This helps to prevent the sometimes-corrosive effects of incremental (or decremental) budgeting in a resource-constrained setting.

It is recommended that, once an updated University strategic plan is in place, school, colleges and administrative units (VP areas) should each work immediately to produce strategic plans that are compatible with the overall plan for the University and harmonious with plans for the other units. Thereafter, each unit should submit an updated 3-5-year strategic plan each year, and an overhaul of its strategic plan every five years.

**Resource Allocation**

Even as UAlbany’s all-funds budget grew significantly -- from $273 million in 2001-2002 to $461 million 2007-2008, the University experienced significant financial challenges. Much of the increase was in research funding, which is restricted for specific purposes and thus not available for reallocation. Earlier in the decade, UAlbany needed to address a structural deficit, limiting its budget flexibility. At this writing, a structural deficit continues to exist. More recently, as a result of state budget cuts, the campus was required to make cuts totaling $14.2 million in the 2008-2009 campus budget. At least $4 million in reductions are expected to be required in the 2009-2010 budget.

It is against this backdrop that UAlbany made resource allocation decisions during the past decade, and it is against this backdrop that the need to enhance University resources has clearly emerged as a major priority.

During President Hitchcock’s tenure, the University Resources and Priorities Advisory Committee (URPAC) was formed to make budget allocation recommendations, with input from deans and vice presidents, using the values and goals outlined in the 1992 Mission Statement and the 1998 Statement of Strategic Values and Goals.
The purpose of URPAC was to make the strategic planning process continuous by establishing a planning committee which would meet on a regular basis throughout the academic year. URPAC was presented each year with the University’s budget, and at the request of the committee various University officers (mostly deans and VPs) were called to offer descriptions of the current work of -- and aspirations for -- their units. URPAC’s analyses and recommendations varied in their degree of granularity. In years when New York State provided increased funding, discussions centered around making investments that were strategic. In years with budget cuts, cuts were relatively uniform across campus units. Because the University (1) employed incremental rather than zero-based budgeting and (2) rarely had incremental resources available, URPAC never considered radical reallocation of resources. Of the remaining monies, the distribution of the core instructional budget is largely fixed costs in the form of salaries and wages which comprise 78% of the total state allocation. Other expenditures include graduate student support (8%), utilities (6%), other than personnel services (OTPS) (5%), undergraduate scholarships (1%), and library acquisitions (1%). Little has remained for new strategic investments.

When President Hall assumed the presidency, he instituted a Compact Planning and Selective Investment process by which deans and vice presidents would submit resource plans to the Compact Planning committee for budgetary resources. Compact Planning was envisioned as a combination of classical incremental and initiative-based budgeting models: incremental, in that the majority of unit-funding was predicated on the previous year’s core budget. However, significant incentive funding was made available for proposals by academic and administrative units for furthering UAlbany goals and priorities. Assessment and evaluative processes played major roles in examining core unit functions and in awarding initiative funding.

A committee of faculty and staff was convened to review Compact Plan submissions and make investment recommendations. The outcome of this exercise — investments to span three academic-year cycles — included faculty investments and one-time funding for programs to enhance the student experience and campus quality-of-life. In addition to the one-time dollars awarded annually through Compact Planning and Selective Investment in 2006 and 2007, 30 permanent faculty lines were awarded during this period.

The 2006 Draft University Goals and Priorities document was created to inform the Compact Planning/Selective Investment process in the second year of the two years in which it operated at UAlbany. As noted earlier, the document’s six points relate to undergraduate program quality, graduate program quality, improved University funding, expansion of the quality and quantity of scholarly exchanges, building University identity and spirit, and enhancing the University’s connection to the outside world for the benefit of overall social and economic welfare.

Members of the Selective Investment Committee attest that the discussion and decision-making were firmly tied to the 2006 document’s six points. The provost offered these as explicit guidance at the start of the second year of the process. In fact, the majority of the first year (2005-06) investment recommendations can be easily mapped to at least one of the six points. This implies that the University’s values and mission were well understood by the proposing units and by the Selective Investment Committee members.
In the second Selective Investment year (2006-07), the committee encouraged standardization of format by requiring proposers to fill out a template. The fourth field on the template was “University goal(s) supported.” In evaluating and selecting proposals for investment, committee members used each proposal’s degree of consonance with the 2006 Draft University Goals and Priorities as a major criterion.

It can be argued that the Selective Investment process had a number of virtuous attributes. First, the University’s administration kicked off the process by providing an organizing framework that signaled institutional priorities. Tying the communication of priorities to a competitive process ensured that the priorities would be more likely to be disseminated, read, and internalized. Second, the proposal-generation process forced each of the University’s units (and sometimes subunits) into self-assessment to consider its own capabilities and goals. The harsh reality of competing for a very limited resource pool forced each unit to put its best foot forward. Third, the within-unit evaluation process required deans to communicate to faculty and staff their own values and priorities. Fourth, the evaluation process by the Selective Investment Committee allowed constituents campus-wide an all-too-rare opportunity to witness the aspirations and talents of others in the institution firsthand. Finally, in view of the multiple levels of careful review, the process tended to reward initiative, creativity, and collaboration.

In years when Selective Investment was not used, the annual budget/planning meetings between deans and the provost involved identifying where budget cuts would be made and what the impacts on the University would be. This process insured that cuts would be made in ways that would have the least impacts on University goals. Nearly all state-supplied funds that flow to UAlbany’s schools and colleges are used to cover faculty and staff salaries and graduate assistants. Therefore, little reallocation took place from year to year. Virtually all non-salary spending uses funds from non-state sources.

As noted, there is evidence that the budget process over the past decade can generally be characterized as incremental. Nonetheless, it is worth noting that several major and costly initiatives were initiated over the past decade. For example, special legislative appropriations made possible significant new investments in CNSE and the Center for Functional Genomics (CFG). In addition, without the infusion of new dollars, the University established the Honors College and the College of Computing and Information. Dollars from the NYS capital plan, rather than operating appropriations, funded the new University Hall building and moves of certain offices to more advantageous locations on campus, such as the Life Sciences Research Building and the newly renovated Arts and Sciences Building.

The enhancements noted above and elaborated on in the “Institutional Renewal” section of this chapter appear to conflict with the claims of a mostly incremental budgetary process. However, certain of the investments have come as a result of opportunistic lobbying efforts with New York State legislators to grant funding for new priorities. The extremely successful CNSE growth has been driven largely by efforts unrelated to intra-institutional budget allocation. Moreover, the New York State capital budget is separate from its operating budget. New buildings, as well as their furnishing and occupation, such as the Life Sciences Research Building and University Hall, are funded through the capital budget, while their ongoing maintenance is funded from the
campus operating budget. Once a building is constructed, occupancy becomes a natural, urgent operating priority, irrespective of the institution’s standard budgeting process.

As noted in Chapter 3, Institutional Resources, general state tax support as a percentage of total revenues under state control has declined over the decade from 24% of the total budget to 16%. Thus, while the relative proportion of dollars under state spending authority at the beginning and end of the self-study period is around 54%, the relative share of these dollars funded by tuition has increased, and the share of direct state appropriation has decreased, leaving students and their parents to shoulder an increasing burden.

The following issues most likely keep the University from aligning its planning and resource allocation processes as closely as they should with its institutional goals:

1. According to the vice president for Finance and Business, for the past 20 years, the University has allocated funds each year to the individual colleges, schools, and administrative units. Thereafter, the deans and vice presidents have discretion over how the funds are used. Up to now, decisions have been made with the interests of the individual units in mind. For example, vice presidents do not necessarily know what the priorities of the other vice presidents are. Even when they do, decisions are not necessarily made using a holistic approach.

2. Management turnover has had several effects. First, president and provost turnover have made it more difficult for the institution to form a coherent strategic vision and pursue a multi-year action plan compatible with that vision. Second, when dean replacements are hired, budgetary reallocations tend to be quite dramatic because deans often come in with promised faculty lines or other resources as part of their “recruitment package.” Thus, the arrival of a new dean can disrupt the budgetary equilibrium existing among units. When this happens repeatedly over the years, the potential for budgetary distortions is large.

3. The total cost of adjunct instructors has become quite burdensome. With nowhere else to turn for funding, the University has chosen to keep some full-time lines vacant to fund adjunct instruction.

4. The University does not have a rainy-day fund for recessions. Therefore, it would be reasonable for the University to develop a plan that anticipates recessions yet allows the institution to continue progressing toward attainment of its goals.

5. The practice of incremental budgeting, over decades, risks producing a situation in which excellence is not rewarded as it should be while areas of mediocrity continue to be nourished. More than one commentator has expressed the view that the time has come for the institution to make tough choices. Large-scale investments of funds and faculty over the past 15 years into the CNSE and CFG, even though largely derived from special state appropriations, have not been clearly communicated as reinforcing the mission and goals of the University to the campus community. Meanwhile, very few programs have been discontinued and administrative offices closed. In a time of scarcity when tough choices
need to be made, it is important for campus leaders to state both what the University is about, and what it is not about.

Despite obvious challenges, the University must align planning and resource allocation more closely with its goals and also regularly communicate these efforts to the University community.

**Institutional Renewal**

One of its key components of the process of renewal is assessment, which at the University has several sources of motivation. In certain fields (e.g., business and education) discipline-specific accrediting bodies mandate that a rigorous assessment program be put in place to support continuous improvement efforts. For the University as a whole, formalized institutional assessment activities were sporadic until early in the decade, and then, as with goal-setting and planning processes, changes in leadership resulted in changing approaches, particularly at the institutional level.

In the fall of 2004, anticipating the changes in accreditation standards and the new emphases on assessment processes outlined in the 2002 edition of the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, UAlbany initiated a process to formalize and harmonize assessment activities.

An Assessment Advisory Committee was convened and charged with making recommendations on an institutional assessment planning process. The committee completed its work in February of 2005 and delivered a draft report to the interim provost.

The [Institutional Assessment Plan](http://www.albany.edu/assessment/iap.html) (IAP) was broad-based in that it was developed with University-wide input. In addition, provisions for assessment in the major units were developed through cooperation between the University administration and the University Senate, which has had a standing committee devoted to assessment, the [Council on Academic Assessment](http://www.albany.edu/senate/caa.htm), since 2004-2005.

The IAP was, as the report states, “... the opening salvo in a long campaign to develop a strong institutional culture of assessment.” Its stated objective was to improve the University’s effectiveness in meeting its goals as reflected in the 1992 Mission Statement, the 1998 Statement of Strategic Values and Goals, the 2006 Draft University Goals and Priorities and the 2006 Mission Review II. The IAP, however, came in the midst of a multi-year change in senior leadership, as documented in Chapter 1, and has not taken root in the consciousness of the campus.

The preparation of the SUNY Mission Review process, the development of the proposed Institutional Assessment Plan, and the Middle States Commission Periodic Review Report were begun during this period of leadership transition. The completion of these important reports continued during this time as well.
In February 2005, President Hall became the 17th President of the University at Albany, and almost immediately signaled his intention to reengage the University community in a different way during the months immediately ahead.

First, he introduced the concept of performance dashboards to the University community as a means of identifying important University and unit performance metrics. The initial University-wide performance dashboard gauged 29 performance measures within seven general categories as follows:

- Student Enrollment - by headcount, FTE, percent graduate, percent out-of-state, and percent multicultural
- Retention and Graduation - by first-year retention rate, six-year graduation rate, NCAA academic progress percentile rank, and national scholarships
- Undergraduate admissions - by freshman applications, freshman enrollees, new transfer students, percent of freshmen in SUNY quality group 1, and average SAT
- Faculty - by student faculty ratio, full-time and part-time headcount, percent female, and percent multicultural
- Research - by total externally funded research, R&D expenditures in science and engineering fields, patent applications, and license income
- Finance - by all-funds revenue, state appropriation as percent of all funds revenue, tuition and fee levels, percent of students receiving financial aid, the alumni giving rate, and endowment funds, and
- National ranking - by U.S. News and World Report tier level

This prompted each University vice president and dean to indentify and analyze important input, outcomes, and process measures for their operations.

In his first address\(^\text{10}\) to the University faculty on April 27, 2005, President Hall outlined his vision of how the University would re-calibrate its basic planning, budget processes, and assessment criteria in order to better focus on future directions and align resources toward agreed-upon goals. This effort to re-calibrate, modeled after similar initiatives at North Carolina State, was designated the University-wide Compact Planning Process.\(^\text{11}\)

As described earlier, the Compact Planning process was begun in the summer of 2005. The Compact Planning concept prompted an intense discussion in the University about basic values, driven from the bottom up. The process focused on values, on linking those values to initiatives between and among units of the University, and on the ability of core units to successfully achieve — and document — unit objectives that were consistent and supportive of the University mission.

The University then integrated its framework for assessment, as outlined in the proposed Institutional Assessment Plan, into the Compact Planning and budgeting process. Specific performance and outcomes measures, like the performance dashboards discussed earlier and

---


\(^{11}\) [Source: The Compact Plan Process “Voices from the Field,” [http://www.albany.edu/academic_affairs/cp/Mallette_FINAL.ppt](http://www.albany.edu/academic_affairs/cp/Mallette_FINAL.ppt)]
other outcomes measures informed by assessment processes, were to be used in Compact Planning to hold units, and the University as a whole, accountable, and to demonstrate publicly the quality and impact of their programs and services.

The main thrust of this approach was to link assessment, budgeting, and performance appraisals through compacts (memorandums of understanding) between superior and subordinate units, across both academic and administrative units. These negotiated compacts were to be the formal planning documents driving the University’s resource allocation and budget processes. The hope was that Compact Plans, because they reflect shared and agreed-upon understandings of unit and University goals and priorities, could be used to shape various other planning and decision-making processes. 12

The Compact Planning process and the newly formed Board of Visitors, described in Chapter 1, were unable to take root in the consciousness of the campus, especially after President Hall’s passing. While changes in leadership have clearly hampered the development of a formalized assessment process at the institutional level, the University has made progress on the assessment front during the past decade.

Every academic program goes through a periodic assessment review. In fall 2008, the provost enacted an assessment model by which school/college assessment liaisons were designated by each dean. Their charge was to coordinate student learning assessment activities and ongoing curricular review processes across the nine schools and colleges. The Council on Academic Assessment has recognized the usefulness of the school/college liaisons and has recommended that departmental assessment coordinators be appointed from the full-time teaching faculty in each academic department to focus on assessment at the program level. In addition, a three-step action plan is being considered by the provost and Council on Academic Assessment to review program curriculum and design; the student body; faculty and staff; assessment of student learning; resources and facilities; and other program-specific criteria.

A more complete discussion of assessment is provided in Chapter 5, which focuses on institutional and student assessment.

Moving ahead, the University must re-focus energy on the institution-level assessment process that was begun so that results can inform planning, resource allocation and improvement. That said, the University has renewed itself in many ways over the past 10 years, with assessment and planning processes at various levels helping to shape the changes.

Curricular development has been impressive. Academic units have kept pace with new and important cutting-edge curricular trends. The nation's first college of nanoscale science and engineering was established in 2004. The Gen*NY* Sis Center for Excellence in Cancer Genomics was established in 2005. Several graduate certificate courses and new master’s programs were approved.

The University-wide interdisciplinary Honors College was launched in 2005. The University also has new majors in journalism, documentary studies, globalization studies, and public health,

12 Source: 2005 Periodic Review Report to Middle States Commission on Higher Education.
among others. New undergraduate majors in nanoscale science and nanoscale engineering are being launched.

Over the course of this self-study period, many projects which directly supported institutional renewal were funded and constructed. The 1998 Master Plan report was a planning blueprint for these projects, which included the Life Sciences Research Building; the Boor Sculpture Studio; University Hall; University Police building; gut renovation to what is now the Arts and Sciences Building; gut renovation to Husted Hall on the Downtown Campus; development of the lighting master plan; improved signage across campus and a new graphics and signage manual to guide future signage development; a new campus-wide fire alarm system; and numerous other upgrades in campus building systems and infrastructure. At the direction of SUNY and the State University Construction Fund, the University at this writing is about to initiate another multi-year facilities master plan process in 2010. As with the 1998 Master Plan, this effort will also be informed and led by the campus mission and goals.

These new facilities have significantly strengthened the University’s research infrastructure. In addition, Empire Commons, a new apartment-style housing complex for students, was opened in 2002, and is an example of efforts to renew the campus living environment for students. So too is the “Purple Path,” a new walking and jogging path being installed around the campus. The proliferation of smart classrooms and the use of other technological classroom tools, combined with an added emphasis on the assessment of student learning outcomes and objectives, highlight the University’s commitment to deliver a high-quality education.

Since its founding in 1844, UAlbany has had a very strong focus on education, public policy, and service to New York State. Over the last 50 years it has developed strong units, programs and courses focusing on international, multicultural and foreign area studies, and most of its professional programs have made internships in the local region a key feature of their educational missions.

UAlbany is justifiably proud of its internship programs, its collaborative links with state government and the stage legislature, and the student efforts channeled through its Community and Public Service Program. Over the last decade, institutional interest in community engagement and outreach activities has increased significantly, and an “Action Plan for Community Engagement at UAlbany” has been developed and submitted to the president and provost for their review.

Since 2000, UAlbany has continued and significantly strengthened its international education activities. President Hall raised the University’s international profile by: engaging in intense diplomacy with China; appointing a vice provost for international education; and initiating a plan to bring dispersed international education units together in new accommodations in the Science Library.

UAlbany is now the largest study-abroad provider in the SUNY System, and it has active concentrations of scholars in such fields as comparative higher education, international relations and comparative politics, East Asian studies, Africana studies, Latin American and Caribbean
studies, European studies, and global health. The recently-established globalization studies major is an excellent example of a faculty-led curricular initiative, originally derived from a student campaign against sweatshops, but, like several other recent initiatives, it does not have the faculty resources for sustained growth.

Beginning in summer 2006, just before the death of President Hall, the newly-reorganized Office of International Education took responsibility for the coordination of a UAlbany Strategic Plan for Internationalization. The goals and objectives of that plan were developed by a faculty working group in consultation with other constituencies around the University; they were reviewed by the provost and deans in summer 2008. They are currently being coordinated with the broader “Going Forward Plan” so that they will finally appear as an elaboration of some of the Going Forward Plan’s goals. The six draft Internationalization Goals listed in Appendix 2.2 are very closely linked to the 2006 Draft University Goals and Priorities.

The “Going Forward Plan” exemplifies ongoing efforts to drive improvements and institutional renewal. This effort involved the participation of approximately 250 members of all areas of the campus community, and the resulting document points to areas for improvement on campus, based on the input of participants. This strong collaborative effort has provided a guidance document for the University’s top management.

Subsequent to the development of the “Going Forward Plan,” then-Interim President Philip convened senior campus leaders in a President’s Budget Advisory Group (BAG) to take the next step in developing a new campus-wide financial plan. The BAG used the “Going Forward Plan,” among other resources, to develop general principles by which the University would respond to the impact of the global financial crisis on its fiscal position. The BAG principles and priorities are listed in Appendix 2.3.

With the BAG’s work completed, Provost Phillips initiated the next step in late spring 2009, forming an advisory group for Academic Affairs to help the campus move toward specific decisions based on the BAG’s general principles and priorities. The group has set out to examine each unit’s priorities and budget situations in a more focused way and identify specific areas for investment or disinvestment.
Appendix 2.1 Summary of Recommendations

- UAlbany’s new leadership team should engage the entire University community to update the campus’s vision statement, Mission Statement, and organizational goals.

- In formulating an updated mission and vision statement, the University should build on the work done for the Going Forward Plan, which puts forth as initial ideas for consideration: “incorporating both research and educational aspects of the University’s enterprise; incorporating restoration of UAlbany as a highly selective institution; incorporating institutional commitment to diversity and global reach; incorporating strategic engagement with UAlbany’s institutional location.”

- A focus on student learning should be considered for inclusion in UAlbany’s strategic goals.

- University leadership should clearly communicate University goals and priorities, and share significant institutional documents with the UAlbany community. The University should consider further developing and harnessing the MyUAlbany portal to communicate info targeted to faculty and staff.

- Once an updated University strategic plan is in place, schools, colleges and administrative units (VP areas) should each initiate their own strategic planning efforts, relating them to the overall plan for the University and plans for other units. Thereafter, require annual submission of updated three to five-year strategic plans by each unit, and overhaul of strategic plans by each unit every five years.

- The University should more closely align planning and resource allocation with its goals, and regularly communicate these efforts to the University community. For example, consider reinstating the Selective Investment process in some form as a mechanism for regular self-evaluation and expression of University priorities.

- The University should develop a plan that anticipates recessions yet allows the institution to continue progressing toward attainment of its goals (perhaps by establishing a “rainy day fund”).

- The University should re-focus energy on the institutional level assessment process so that results can inform planning, resource allocation and improvement. This effort should include development of and frequent updates to the University’s Institutional Assessment Plan.
Appendix 2.2 Draft Internationalization Goals

1. Strategically enhance academic offerings in areas central to the international agenda by strengthening existing instructional programs and introducing new programs.

2. Increase international research, teaching and service of University faculty.

3. Build international alumni networks, link to foundations and donors that will support enhanced international activity, and develop partnerships with selected international agencies and foreign universities.

4. Increase the number and overall quality of international students at the University.

5. Increase the number of University at Albany students studying abroad, traveling internationally, and engaging in international research and service learning.

6. Promote events, activities, publications and information diffusion that foster global awareness among the University community and in the Capital Region.
Appendix 2.3 Budget Advisory Group (BAG) Principles and Priorities

1. Preserve and promote the University’s CORE MISSION and sustain—to the extent possible—those areas that are essential to maintaining that core.

2. Direct funds in ways that best support CORE activities/areas before others that, while valuable, are less essential; CORE activities include:

   * Providing high-quality undergraduate education
   * Producing scholarly knowledge/creative work
   * Providing high-quality graduate education

3. Seek greater EFFICIENCY (while maintaining quality) before reducing resources.

Greater efficiency may be achievable in many areas, including instruction, instructional support services, physical and IT infrastructure, extracurricular activities and organizations.

Examples to consider in the area of instruction (not all achievable in a one-year time frame) to be considered could include:

   a. The efficient content of undergraduate curriculum requirements, including minors, General Education
   b. The efficient composition and activities of faculty workforce
      i. Achieving an optimal balance of full-time vs. part-time
      ii. Considering an array of activities (e.g., teaching-intensive positions, research-intensive, etc)
      iii. Reviewing and updating equitable contributions to various elements of the University’s mission (teaching, research, service); enforcing full workload expectations
   c. The efficient structure of curriculum delivery: credit hours, such as might be found in a “4x4” model; mode of instruction delivery, such as lecture and online
   d. Broader allocation of instructional activity over time: hours in the day, days in the week, semesters/trimesters in the year

4. Establish OPTIMAL LEVEL OF ENROLLMENT to serve the core mission and provide adequate revenue.

5. Investigate and introduce initiatives designed to ENHANCE REVENUE and other resources, guided by a sound financial plan, even in light of constraints, such as residential housing, maintaining respectable class sizes, and working with a finite number of instructors. Some options to consider include:

   a. Increase numbers of nontraditional students, e.g., individuals in the workforce, retirees, high school students
b. Increase offerings at nontraditional times, locations, and delivery methods, e.g., weekend and intensive classes; online classes

c. Increase enrollment in nontraditional academic terms, e.g., a trimester system; enhanced summer programs; intersession programs

6. Seek INSTITUTIONAL benefit before INDIVIDUAL benefit.

7. Seek to implement the following PRIORITIES:

a. Sustain programmatic and intellectual quality/strength:
   i. Preserve/grow areas of strength, reputation, and/or quality academic programs
   ii. Retain high-quality faculty

b. In the area of research:
   i. Preserve/grow external funding
   ii. Preserve/grow scholarly publication

c. For curriculum and students:
   i. Sustain services to students, e.g., advisement, financial aid, that directly support their enrollment and retention
   ii. Maintain/support the University Libraries
   iii. Honor scholarship and support commitments to undergraduate and graduate students
   iv. Ensure adequate course availability to meet the needs of currently enrolled students
   v. Enhance/invest in programs and initiatives that aim to improve students’ critical thinking, problem-solving, and communication and analytical skills

d. Beyond the curriculum:
   i. Support/develop initiatives that maintain and improve the safety of the campus community
   ii. Maintain/improve the condition of UAlbany’s classrooms and academic spaces
   iii. Ensure sufficient support for technological and communication infrastructure
   iv. Preserve/grow efforts to improve the University website
   v. Sustain extra-curricular programs, e.g., Res Life, alcohol education, educational programs, Danes After Dark

e. For further revenue-generation, support efforts to secure external resources through fund-raising and development