Executive Summary

The University at Albany (UAlbany) is one of four University Centers within the State University of New York (SUNY). Located on three campuses in two contiguous New York counties, UAlbany enrolled 18,126 students in fall 2008, of whom 13,243 were undergraduates and 4,883 were graduate students. The institution employed 658 full-time faculty in fall 2008, of whom 64.9% held continuing appointment (tenure). UAlbany offers a comprehensive and rich program of undergraduate and graduate education, as well as graduate certificates and certificates of advanced study.

In the past few decades, The University at Albany has evolved rapidly, transforming itself from a distinguished college for teachers into a high-quality research university with an internationally recognized and highly productive faculty, an accomplished student body, and nationally recognized academic programs. Its traditional missions of undergraduate and graduate teaching, research, and service are distinctively integrated to produce an intellectual and programmatic synergy that defines the University. Today, the University (“UAlbany”) is distinguished by excellence within distinctive disciplines and professions, and by extensive scholarship and teaching across disciplines, including many combined accelerated degree options that meld knowledge and application. At the undergraduate level, UAlbany strives to offer an undergraduate curriculum enriched by its research environment, as well as a student body that is among the most ethnically, culturally, and geographically diverse within SUNY. In recent years, the University’s stature and achievements have also been greatly accelerated through increased capital investment, upgrades to create a Division I athletics program, and increased outreach and advancement efforts.

To a large degree, the self-study decade has been one marked by a considerable number of senior leadership transitions, particularly at the presidential and vice presidential/provostial level. While UAlbany began the decade of the 2000s with relative stability at the senior levels of its administration, the University has been served by six presidents, interim presidents or officers in charge, and five provosts or interim provosts from 2004 through 2009. Arguably, one factor contributing to UAlbany’s senior leadership transitions during the 2004 to 2009 period was a similar period of transition at the State University of New York system level, where the position of SUNY Chancellor has been filled by five different individuals during this time period. It should also be noted that, with the possible exception of two years (2005-2007), this has been a time of significant fiscal difficulty in New York State’s public sector. While frequent senior leadership transitions have provided some challenges to meeting Middle States standards, the degree to which they have influenced achievement varies by standard. Indeed, as demonstrated in all chapters of the self-study, the organizational structures, long standing administrative processes, and initiatives established by each subsequent administration have in fact strengthened UAlbany’s case for reaccreditation. Furthermore, as documented in the self-study, each successive administration, for the most part, has built upon the initiatives, goals, and priorities of prior administrations to help ensure that UAlbany continuously would meet its overarching goals and objectives. For example, UAlbany’s capacity to assess student learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness, which began in the early 2000s under President Hitchcock, has consistently been nurtured and strengthened by each successive administration.
Because UAlbany recognized that the self-study would be conducted during a time of transition, the re-accreditation process was very much welcomed as a powerful opportunity to demonstrate the evidence behind the University’s continuing ascent to the upper echelons of American higher education. A decision was therefore made to conduct a comprehensive self-study, since this design would best serve the University’s interests at this time. In conducting the self-study, some accreditation standards were grouped together in the formal self-study design, resulting in nine working subcommittees: Mission and Goals - Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal; Institutional Resources; Leadership, Governance and Administration (including the Libraries and ITS); Institutional Assessment and Assessment of Student Learning; Student Admissions and Retention; Student Support Services; Faculty; Educational Offerings and General Education; and Related Educational Activities. Integrity, and evidence that UAlbany meets this standard, was infused throughout the nine chapters.

The specific goals and objectives of the self-study, as outlined in the self-study design, were:

1. To examine and assess the state of the institution’s current mission, goals, policies, procedures, structures, educational and related offerings and activities, research, teaching, assessment mechanisms, and resources.

2. To empower a broad University constituency to participate in all aspects of the self-study process, ensuring the maximum representation of various constituencies within the University, as well as ownership of the process, its contents, and resulting recommendations.

3. To identify the institution’s strengths and weaknesses relative to each of the accreditation standards, in light of the University’s mission and goals.

4. To make specific recommendations for improvement, particularly in assessment, planning, and resource allocation processes.

Using careful, evidence-based analyses, the self-study process highlighted a number of strengths of the university as well as challenges we face at this time. While some of the challenges we face are typical of universities around the country, others are unique to UAlbany’s particular circumstances. Overall, the willingness of the campus to engage in an open and honest assessment of the previous decade led to a number of recommendations that will be useful to the campus over the next decade.

Focusing first on strengths, we note that despite leadership transitions over the course of the self-study period, the University at Albany has remained focused on and further developed a number of key areas of strength, which undergird its ability to achieve the standards of accreditation. In particular, UAlbany’s nationally ranked and world-class academic programs; significant capital investments and infrastructure improvements; a strong collegial faculty and staff; a strong emphasis on and refocused commitment to undergraduate student success; and academically driven athletic success are noted as areas of strength in this self-study document.

Perhaps the most distinctive strength of UAlbany is its collection of academic programs. Across the University, a rich learning and research environment is marked by a highly accomplished faculty who have been essential to delivering high quality academic programs. The faculty members who have been recruited to the campus since its transformation into a major research
university are dedicated teachers and internationally visible and respected researchers who are active and productive scholars in their respective fields. Indeed, UAlbany now offers an array of 63 undergraduate and 38 Ph.D. programs, comparable to the breadth at much larger flagship universities. Many of these programs are already ranked among the very best in the country. In addition, 23 graduate certificates and certificates of advanced study and 77 professional and traditional master’s programs prepare students for successful careers in a broad range of fields.

Built upon UAlbany’s academic offerings, the University’s research portfolio has grown considerably over the self-study period and is recognized as a strength that extends into the classroom. UAlbany faculty are now responsible for nearly $350 million in externally generated research activity; the University now boasts five federally funded research centers. In addition, there are more than 50 research centers, institutes, and specialized labs that are funded from other sources.

The 1998 Master Plan largely set the stage for the capital investment and infrastructure developments that have taken place in this decade, and each of UAlbany’s leadership teams has pursued significant infrastructure improvements that successive administrations have advanced and brought to fruition. The past decade has seen the building of the Boor Sculpture Studio and the Life Sciences Research Building, as well as significant expansion of the Fuller Road campus, which houses the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering; and development of the East Campus, home to the School of Public Health and Cancer Research Center. In addition, a multi-million dollar signage and entry-way improvement project has significantly enhanced the University’s ability to attract and retain high quality faculty and students.

The self-study period also saw important growth in our campus athletics programs. With eight America East conference championships and five teams in NCAA Tournament appearances, the 2006-07 season was UAlbany athletics’ most celebrated since the University moved to NCAA Division I level in 1999. In that season, UAlbany boasted 53 all-conference selections, while 46 student-athletes were named to conference all-academic teams. The following year, 64 student athletes were all-conference selections, and 62 were honored as such in 2008-09. In the most recently completed academic year at time of this writing, 2008-09, UAlbany won seven conference titles and placed two teams in NCAA tournaments. Most importantly, UAlbany’s NCAA Academic Progress Rate (APR) across the 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08 academic years, has consistently been in the high 900s for its Division I sports offerings.

In the area of student support services, the self-study found much evidence of UAlbany’s consistently strong commitment to providing needed services for its students. From residence hall programming to the services provided by the Advisement Services Center, the Office of Academic Support Services and the Educational Opportunities Program (EOP), a variety of measures, such as the SUNY Student Opinion Survey (SOS), indicate that students perceive the support mechanisms they receive at UAlbany to be carefully designed and delivered to support student needs.
Nevertheless, the University has faced a number of challenges over the past decade, as well as some issues the campus knows it needs to address as UAlbany moves into the next decade. First and foremost is the need to update the Mission Statement, which was originally developed in 1992. Similarly, as we undertook the self-study, it was evident that University needed to develop a new strategic plan, one that would recognize UAlbany’s accomplishments and achievements over the past decade, and focus its efforts for the years to come. Over the past few years, as several individual units and University-wide committees (e.g., Information Technology Services, the Office of International Education, and the Steering Committee on Community Engagement) have developed focused strategic plans, the campus has become increasingly aware of the need for these plans to be integrated into a larger campus plan. Indeed, on October 15, 2009, at the fall faculty meeting, President Philip announced the initiation of just such a process.
Another general challenge confronting the University is the need to build upon current efforts to enhance assessment practices. While considerable progress has been made over recent years to promote a culture of assessment on campus, especially with respect to teaching and learning, assessment activities are uneven and inconsistent. Assessment of administrative units has not been conducted in systematic and regular ways, due in part to the frequent turnover in senior leadership.

An additional critical theme that emerges consistently in the chapters of the self-study is the need for better communication among the various stakeholders at the University. The self-study notes that decision-making processes by senior administrators pertaining to budgets and the allocation of resources have not always been made clear to faculty, staff, and students in a timely fashion. Frequent transitions in senior leadership have impeded the development of the kinds of trust and mutual expectations that facilitate effective, shared governance. Many in the University are largely unaware of the activities of key governing bodies, such as the SUNY-wide Senate, the SUNY Board of Trustees, and the University Council.

A final, more overarching challenge to the University is the need to foster a stronger sense of community. Analyses conducted for the self-study reveal many strengths and reasons for pride in UAlbany. Nevertheless, these analyses also suggest that the University is not doing as well as it could in recruiting and retaining high-performing students and outstanding faculty. Moreover, other research conducted by various units indicates that the University has not done a good job of publicizing its accomplishments; as a result, many faculty, staff, current students and UAlbany alumni, as well as members of the Capital Region community, are unaware of many of the accomplishments of the “UAlbany family.”

Overall, the self-study process provided a perfect opportunity to examine the University as a whole, to identify its strengths and weaknesses, and to give the campus an opportunity to make suggestions based on the findings of the study’s analyses. The University at Albany is currently at an important point of transition, and it is expected that this self-study will provide a strong foundation for the current Strategic Planning process as well as for other planning initiatives that the University will undertake over coming years.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Overview

The University at Albany has evolved rapidly, transforming itself from a distinguished college for teachers into a high-quality research university with an internationally recognized and highly productive faculty, an accomplished student body, and nationally recognized academic programs. Its traditional missions of undergraduate and graduate teaching, research, and service are distinctively integrated to produce an intellectual and programmatic synergy that defines the University. Today, the University (―UAlbany‖) is distinguished by excellence within distinctive disciplines and professions, and by extensive scholarship and teaching across disciplines, including many combined accelerated degree options that meld knowledge and application.

Within the context of significantly expanding research and graduate strength, the University is equally defined by its undergraduate enterprise, offering bachelor’s degrees in 58 majors, and a wide variety of co-curricular and extra-curricular opportunities. As a highly selective institution that aspires to become most selective, the University at Albany strives to offer an undergraduate curriculum enriched by its research environment, as well as a student body that is among the most ethnically, culturally, and geographically diverse within SUNY. In recent years, the University’s stature and achievements have also been greatly accelerated through increased capital investment, upgrades to create a Division I athletics program, and increased outreach and advancement efforts.

In this introductory chapter, we begin with a brief outline of the University’s historical development from a normal college to a college for teachers to a research university. Next, we talk about UAlbany’s most recent past, the self-study period (2000-2009). While, for some, this past decade has been defined by a relatively large number of leadership transitions, there has also been a great deal of stability, as well as progress, during this decade. This chapter thus describes the series of leadership transitions that provides a context for much of the decade, and then presents some areas of strength and challenges the University faces as it moves into the next decade. The chapter concludes with a brief overview of the self-study process and lays out the chapters included in this document.

Historical Development of the University at Albany: (1844-2000)

From Normal School to New York State College for Teachers: The University at Albany, the oldest state-chartered public institution of higher education in New York, opened its doors as the New York State Normal School on December 18, 1844. Establishing the institution was a major part of New York’s response to the rapidly expanding education movement in the 1840s and to increasing dissatisfaction with the quality of teachers in the state’s common schools. Thus, the new Normal School’s mission was both to train new and upgrade existing common school teachers. The founders were committed to a new idea of what constituted an excellent teacher, and at the outset sought to establish an institution dedicated to “the instruction and practice of teachers of common schools in the science of education and the art of teaching.” While the linkage of theory and practice, and the conviction that a teacher must be educated in both
pedagogy and content, were revolutionary concepts in 1844, their implementation in the New York State Normal School was soon emulated across the nation and in Europe as well. Thus, from its earliest beginnings, the institution that would become the University at Albany had a national and international reputation for innovation, excellence, and influence.

By 1890, it was widely recognized that the emerging system of public secondary schools in New York State required an expanded curriculum for teacher training. President William Milne, who served as the institution’s chief executive from 1889 to 1914, led the transition from a two-year to a four-year institution. In 1905, the Normal School became the four-year New York State Normal College, offering for the first time B.A., B.S. and Bachelor of Pedagogy degrees. When the College’s original building burned in 1906, a new campus that reflected the greatly expanded mission of the College was constructed and dedicated in 1909.

In 1914, the institution was renamed the New York State College for Teachers and assigned the mission of training teachers in academic subjects for the state’s burgeoning secondary school movement. In addition, in 1914, the College introduced its first graduate programs designed for the advanced education of secondary school teachers and administrators. Over the next several decades, through the 1940s, the College proceeded rapidly to develop the full range of arts and sciences bachelor’s and master’s programs geared to the continuing professional needs of secondary educators.

**From New York State College for Teachers to University Center:** In 1948, the College became part of the newly established State University of New York (SUNY), and in the following year Evan R. Collins began his two-decade tenure as president, leading the institution during prestigious years as a college for teachers and then into its transition to university status. In this period, the state’s educational planners concluded that New York’s independent colleges and universities could not address the demands of the post-World War II “baby boom” generation; as a result, under the leadership of Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, funding for the State University of New York was dramatically increased. As part of SUNY’s expansion plan, the College for Teachers was designated a doctoral-degree granting “University Center” in 1962. And in September of that year, the University at Albany enrolled its first class of undergraduate students in liberal arts programs that did not include any required study in teacher education. The new university adopted the model of a broad-based public research institution, charged with providing a liberal arts education for large numbers of undergraduates, developing graduate programs and professional schools, and building a research program.

The 1960s was a decade of unparalleled UAlbany growth. Student enrollment increased from 4,000 in 1962 to nearly 14,000 in 1971. Curricula and degree programs were expanded at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. A College of Arts and Sciences was established in 1962, and professional schools in business, criminal justice, nursing, public administration, and social welfare were added, joining the long-established School of Education. A new campus, the modern complex designed by Edward Durrell Stone that is now the Uptown Campus, was built and dedicated by 1968. The faculty adopted new bylaws during the 1965-66 academic year and a new Faculty Senate, with its system of councils, began to oversee UAlbany’s expanded academic program. By the end of the 1960s, the University offered 49 baccalaureate programs, 52 master’s
programs and 28 doctoral programs. The first doctoral degree was awarded in 1964 and, within a
decade, 100 doctoral degrees were being awarded each year.

Defining a New Mission: After experiencing dramatic growth in the 1960s, the University faced
a number of challenges in the 1970s. And, by 1974, several compelling environmental factors
indicated a need for the campus to re-evaluate its programs. First, it became clear that the
enrollments and resources projected in the 1968 and 1972 Master Plans were not going to be
realized. The state’s fiscal condition was worsening, and preliminary signs pointed to significant
budget reductions for at least a two-year period. Second, students’ interests had shifted away
from once popular fields of study to others. A minor internal reallocation of resources had
occurred, but could not keep up with these enrollment shifts, leaving some schools and
departments under-enrolled and others understaffed. Third, several graduate programs had been
introduced with the expectation of future resources, but those resources had been spread too
thinly to offer a full range of high-quality graduate and undergraduate programs. Finally, the
budgetary erosion of the early 1970s had highlighted the fact that the campus needed to make
hard choices among its programs; it became clearly recognized that the traditional, across-the-
board allocation of resources would not advance the institution’s goals and objectives.

In this context, a Select Committee on Academic Program Priorities was established in spring
1975 to undertake a broad, detailed review of the University’s entire academic program and to
develop options for the future. Their report, issued in May and implemented in June by departing
President Louis T. Benezet, recommended phasing out, by termination or suspension, six
doctoral programs, three master’s programs, and three baccalaureate programs. The committee
also identified several other programs for further study and subsequent review, and
recommended that five programs be given a high priority for increased resources. While no
changes were recommended for 80% of the campus’s degree programs, the recommendations
brought substantial disruption, which continued into the next year following Emmett W. Field’s
appointment as president in July 1975.

President Fields sought to focus the strategic mission of the University by emphasizing the
institution’s comparative advantage in public policy. This approach built on UAlbany’s location
in New York’s state capital city and the institution’s strong faculty and academic programs in the
professions and public affairs, particularly in those areas of critical state need. A Task Force on
Resources and Priorities was created to develop recommendations for implementing this vision.
Impending further state budget reductions beginning in 1976 gave additional urgency to the Task
Force’s work. Following the final report of the Task Force, President Fields acted to eliminate
four doctoral, four master’s and seven bachelor’s programs. One school and three administrative
offices also were eliminated, and others were reorganized or consolidated; significant funds were
reallocated to departments and schools that had been given a high priority on the basis of their
quality, their enrollment demand, and/or their ability to contribute significantly to the strategic
focus on public policy. The July 1977 Report, “Missions, Programs, and Priorities for Action,”
provided a long-range vision and direction that guided the University’s development for the next
decade. In addition, Vincent O’Leary, who chaired the Select Committee and who also served as
a member of the Task Force, succeeded Fields as president.
Fiscal issues and budget constraints continued to affect the campus over the next decade. Although state funding nearly doubled between 1979 and 1989, it barely kept pace with inflation. The 1980s was also a period in which the campus managed relentless annual state budget “mini-crisis” (e.g., delayed budgets, mid-year reductions, restrictions on personnel appointments and travel). In spite of these challenges, the University showed remarkable resilience and determination to advance its national stature and reputation. Over the four years following the Task Force report, UAlbany attracted more than 250 scholars to the faculty, including 70 appointed at the senior academic rank. This large cadre of nationally and internationally prominent scholars was recruited with careful planning, particularly to strengthen the institution’s graduate academic program and research profile. By 1989, external research and training support increased to four times what it was at the beginning of the decade; it had become a critical and integral element of the campus’ financial plan. The undergraduate program was strengthened by the introduction of a new General Education program in 1982. Learning centers in mathematics, writing, physics, chemistry and computing, as well as tutoring programs and a faculty mentor program, were established to support student achievement and success. To inform academic and administrative decision-making, the University’s Office of Institutional Research created and initiated an educational outcomes assessment model; it received national recognition in the evolving educational assessment agenda.

In 1987, a statewide initiative developed by SUNY Chancellor Clifton Wharton provided targeted resources for the four doctoral granting SUNY centers. The Graduate Education and Research Initiative (GRI) was a multi-year program directed toward four primary goals: develop multidisciplinary Centers of Excellence to respond to state needs, the growth of research-based industry and the state’s economy; double the volume of externally sponsored research; double the number of Ph.D. programs ranking among the top 10% in the nation and double, as well, the number of others rated in the top third; and increase substantially the enrollment of minorities, women, and other groups then underrepresented at UAlbany in graduate and professional programs. While this initiative was not fully funded, the resources were nonetheless instrumental in accelerating the growth and development of many of the interdisciplinary research and academic programs that had been initiated in the prior years and that would become the basis for UAlbany’s leap in stature in the 1990s.

Reaffirming a Commitment to Excellence (1990-1999): The University at Albany’s evolution into a major research university continued during the 1990s, initially under the leadership of H. Patrick Swygert, 15th President, and then, under the leadership of Karen R. Hitchcock, 16th President. During this decade, UAlbany’s trajectory into the ranks of the nation’s leading graduate education and research institutions was articulated for the first time as an explicit, public aspiration. The goal was reflected in key institutional documents created throughout the decade, e.g., the University’s Mission Statement, revised in 1992; President Hitchcock’s 1996 Inaugural Address, Engaging the Future; the University’s 1998 Strategic Plan, Charting the Future: Creating a New Learning Environment for the 21st Century; and a Mission Review statement, developed in 1999 as part of a SUNY-wide process for clearly articulating each campus’s institutional mission. The capacity to realize this goal was rooted in the quality of the faculty at the beginning of the decade, and was affirmed by numerous reviews and analyses ranking many of UAlbany’s academic and research programs among the nation’s best. For example, Graham and Diamond’s 1997 study, The Rise of American Research Universities,
ranked the University at Albany 17th in research and scholarship among the nation’s top public universities.

Progress in advancing the University’s reputation during the 1990s was particularly remarkable because it occurred at a time when the campus’s funding base had to be dramatically restructured. Like other major research universities, the University at Albany became less dependent on state tax dollar support in the 1990s, and increasingly dependent on tuition and fees, auxiliary revenues, and increased revenues from external grants and contracts, alumni, industry and other private sources. The proportion of the institution’s annual operating expenditures derived from state tax dollars declined from 43% in 1989-90 to 26% in 1998-99. During the decade, the University developed a number of innovative and successful partnerships with industry and government to leverage resources for expanding and enhancing both facilities and program. The Center for Environmental Sciences and Technology Management (CESTM) and the East Campus, for example, provided expanded and enriched educational and research opportunities for faculty and students, involved UAlbany in collaborative ventures with important constituencies (e.g., industry partners), and were instrumental in advancing the institution’s public service mission.

The institution’s research and graduate education programs expanded further during the 1990s. Doctoral programs in biometry and statistics, English, epidemiology, French studies, history, information science, philosophy, and public health were either restored or introduced. Other important curricular additions at the graduate level established during this period included master’s programs in biodiversity and policy, public health, taxation, and women’s studies; and new graduate certificate programs were initiated in public sector management, policy and analysis, and urban education.

At the undergraduate level, UAlbany began to experience a much more competitive recruiting environment in the 1990s. During the 1980s, the number of high school graduates in New York State, the source of virtually all of UAlbany’s entering freshman classes, declined by 33%, and this trend continued from 1990 to 1994, when high school graduates declined further by 6%. In response to these environmental changes, the University mounted a campus-wide effort, based on its student outcomes analyses, to focus attention on the quality of the student experience in the classroom. The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning was established to promote excellence in teaching and learning throughout the University and to support and assist faculty and graduate assistants in their professional development as teachers. New curricula were developed—e.g., Project Renaissance (an interdisciplinary, living-learning program limited to freshman students), honors courses, faculty-initiated interdisciplinary majors, expanded internships, increased opportunities for study abroad—to distinguish UAlbany’s undergraduate academic experience from that offered at competing institutions. In addition, in order to attract top students, a Presidential Scholars program was established. Substantial investments were also made to strengthen recruitment not only in New York but also in surrounding states and overseas, projecting Albany beyond its traditional pools of applicants.

In 1997, President Hitchcock approved a campus-backed proposal to move the University’s intercollegiate athletic program to the Division I level, a decision highly popular with students, alumni, and the Albany community. This decision appeared to be the appropriate next step, following President Swygert’s initiative to move the campus to Division II status in 1994.
The 1990s was also a time of substantial changes to the University’s infrastructure. At the beginning of the decade, the Uptown Campus, constructed in the 1960s on the western edge of the City of Albany, had not received any significant rehabilitation or new building to accommodate the needs of a student population that had grown to more than 16,000 — approximately 5,000 more than the campus’s original design capacity. The institution’s research program had also grown in excess of original expectations, and the modes of instruction had changed in ways that affected the functionality of classrooms and other teaching spaces. The Downtown Campus was in similar need of rehabilitation and expansion. Appreciating the severe handicap that lack of adequate space and aging facilities placed on the campus, both presidents Swygert and Hitchcock made capital construction and facilities renovation a major priority. Arguably, the momentum for much needed capital construction and improvements dramatically increased in 1996, when President Hitchcock, working with the SUNY Construction Fund, received approval to conduct a $1 million Master Planning Process. The process produced a 10-year Master Plan, and ultimately led to funding for the planning, design, and construction of the Life Sciences Research Building, the Boor Sculpture Studio, a new facility for the University Police Department, and a new administration/admissions building (University Hall) to serve as an attractive and convenient public-friendly “front door” to the Uptown Campus. Funded as well were a Campus Center Extension, the Recreation and Convocation Center (now the SEFCU Arena), CESTM, and the Science Library. The plan also led to the renovation and upgrading of selected academic buildings on both the Uptown and Downtown campuses, major renovation and rehabilitation projects in the residence halls, and improvements in parking, walk-ways, and landscaping. In addition, the 58-acre East Campus was acquired in 1996 to house the University’s School of Public Health and to support partnership initiatives involving industry and other research institutions in the area of biotechnology and biomedical research.

The Self-Study Decade (2000-2009): The past decade has been a decade marked by a considerable number of senior leadership transitions, particularly at the presidential and vice presidential/provostial level. While UAlbany began the decade of the 2000s with relative stability at the senior levels of its administration, the University has been served by six presidents, interim presidents or officers in charge, and five provosts or interim provosts from 2004 through 2009. These transitions have affected, and been affected by, many different aspects of UAlbany’s operation and the achievement of its mission. Specific ways in which senior turnover affected the University’s pursuit of the Middle States standards of accreditation are cited throughout the self-study, most notably in Chapter 2, Mission, Goals, Planning and Resource Allocation and, in Chapter 3, Institutional Resources. While frequent senior leadership transitions have provided some challenges to meeting Middle States standards, the degree to which they have influenced achievement varies by standard. Indeed, as demonstrated in all chapters of the self-study, the organizational structures, long standing administrative processes, and initiatives established by each subsequent administration have in fact strengthened UAlbany’s case for reaccreditation. Furthermore, as documented in the following pages, each successive administration, for the most part, has built upon the initiatives, goals, and priorities of prior administrations to help ensure that UAlbany continuously would meet its overarching goals and objectives. An important case that points to how one administration built upon the foundation set by earlier leaders, is the substantial strengthening of UAlbany’s capacity to assess student learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness, which began in the early 2000s under President Hitchcock. As documented in Chapter 5, Institutional Effectiveness and the
Assessment of Student Learning, the seeds that the Hitchcock administration sowed in the assessment arena back in 2002 have been recognized, nurtured, and strengthened by each successive administration. Similarly, many of the myriad capital infrastructure improvements that UAlbany has made over the self-study period and documented in Chapter 3, Institutional Resources, were spawned in one administration, championed and lobbied for in the next, and brought to fruition in yet another. Of note is the fact that in 2008 then Interim President Philip embraced the self-study process as a valuable vehicle to organize the campus to take stock of its strengths and areas for improvement in preparation for the eventual installment of its next president and leadership team.

For the record, at the time of last accreditation in 2000, Karen R. Hitchcock was the 16th President of the University. In October 2003, Dr. Hitchcock announced that she would be leaving UAlbany, and in January 2004 departed, soon thereafter becoming principal and vice chancellor of Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario. Judy Genshaft, provost in the late 1990s and a major participant in the development of UAlbany’s 1998 strategic plan, left UAlbany in 2000 to assume the presidency of the University of South Florida. Provost Genshaft was replaced in May 2000 by Carlos Santiago, who served as interim provost from May 2000 through 2001, and then was appointed permanently to the position in summer 2001. After Dr. Hitchcock left the campus, Dr. Santiago served briefly as officer in charge during much of January 2004.

In February 2004, the SUNY Board of Trustees named SUNY Maritime College President Vice Admiral John R. Ryan, USN (Ret.), as UAlbany’s interim president, with Dr. Santiago returning to the position of provost until May 2004, when he left to assume the chancellorship of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Jeryl Mumpower, the associate provost and dean of Graduate Studies at the time, was named interim provost, a post he filled until September 2005. It should also be noted that between 2000 and 2005, Dr. Mumpower served in a variety of administrative positions, in both interim and permanent capacities, including dean of Graduate Studies, interim provost, interim vice president for Research, and interim dean of both the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Public Health.

Vice Admiral Ryan served as interim president through January 2005, when Kermit Hall was named UAlbany’s 17th President. In September 2005, Susan V. Herbst joined UAlbany as provost and vice president for Academic Affairs. After President Hall’s untimely death in August 2006, Provost Herbst was asked by the SUNY Trustees to serve as well as UAlbany’s officer in charge. During the 2006-07 academic year, Dr. Herbst asked Frank J. Thompson, former dean of the Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy, to serve in a limited capacity as interim provost, with primary responsibilities for provostial review of tenure and promotion cases. In October 2007, Provost and Officer in Charge Herbst left UAlbany to become the executive vice chancellor for the University System of Georgia. George Philip, chair of UAlbany’s University Council, the SUNY campus equivalent of a local board of trustees, was named by the SUNY Trustees to serve first as officer in charge, and then as interim president. Interim President Philip appointed Susan D. Phillips, then dean of the School of Education, to serve as interim provost in January 2008, filling the provost’s vacancy after Dr. Herbst left. In December 2008, Dr. Phillips was appointed provost and vice president for Academic Affairs. And in June 2009, the SUNY Trustees, with the unanimous support of the UAlbany presidential
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search committee, approved SUNY Chancellor Nancy Zimpher’s nomination of George Philip to serve as the 18th President of the University at Albany.

For purposes of discussion throughout the self-study, all officers in charge, interim presidents, and presidents are referred to more generically as presidents. Similarly, all interim and permanent provosts are referred to as provosts.

While the particularities of events and the dynamic political interplay that gave rise to the leadership transitions over this time period are beyond the scope of this self-study, it is worth noting that a contributing factor to UAlbany’s senior leadership transitions during the 2004 to 2009 period was a similar period of transition at the State University of New York system level; from 2004 through 2009, a time of significant fiscal difficulty in the New York public sector, the SUNY chancellor’s role was filled by five different individuals. As a matter of necessity, and prudent policy, the SUNY Chancellor plays a major role in the hiring of SUNY campus presidents. As a result, senior SUNY leadership transitions, while perhaps not a driving factor in UAlbany’s transitory leadership, did at various times delay the presidential search process.

Strengths and Challenges

As noted above, while UAlbany’s and SUNY system’s senior leadership transitions have presented challenges for the University’s achievement of the Middle States standards of accreditation, they have differentially influenced the attainment of these standards. The organizational structures and processes that successive administrations have used, and the commitment of UAlbany faculty, staff, and students to the underlying ideals that drive the Middle States standards of accreditation have been instrumental in helping the University build on its successes. Nevertheless, the University faces a number of challenges, some typical of universities around the country and others unique to UAlbany’s particular circumstances. This self-study discusses some of the University’s key strengths and challenges as it moves into the next decade.

Despite leadership transitions over the course of the self-study period, the University at Albany has remained focused on and further developed a number of key areas of strength, which undergird its ability to achieve the standards of accreditation. In particular, UAlbany’s nationally ranked and world-class academic programs; significant capital investments and infrastructure improvements; a strong collegial faculty and staff; a strong emphasis on and refocused commitment to undergraduate student success; and academically driven athletic success are noted as areas of strength in this self-study document.

Perhaps the most distinctive strength of UAlbany is its collection of academic programs. Across the University, a rich learning and research environment is marked by a highly accomplished faculty who have been essential to delivering high quality academic programs. The faculty members who have been recruited to the campus since its transformation into a major research university are dedicated teachers and internationally visible and respected researchers who are active and productive scholars in their respective fields. Indeed, UAlbany now offers an array of 63 undergraduate and 38 Ph.D. programs, comparable to the breadth at much larger flagship
universities. Many of these programs are already ranked among the very best in the country.\textsuperscript{1} Still others are positioned to move into the ranks of our nation’s premier programs for their disciplines. In addition, 23 graduate certificates and certificates of advanced study and 77 professional and traditional master’s programs prepare students for successful careers in a broad range of fields. Through their academic experiences, students acquire the knowledge and skills to bring systematic knowledge to bear on professional practice and policy of New York State, the Northeast and beyond. Chapter 9, Educational Offerings and General Education, details specifically how UAlbany’s educational programs meet the Middle States standard of accreditation, and Chapter 5, Institutional Effectiveness and the Assessment of Student Learning, provides evidence-based analyses that demonstrate the strength of UAlbany’s curricula.

Built upon UAlbany’s academic offerings, the University’s research portfolio has grown considerably over the self-study period and is recognized as a strength that extends into the classroom. As Chapter 8, Faculty, details, UAlbany faculty are now responsible for nearly $350 million in externally generated research activity; the University now boasts five federally funded research centers. In addition, there are more than 50 research centers, institutes, and specialized labs that are funded from other sources.

The 1998 Master Plan largely set the stage for the capital investment and infrastructure developments that have taken place in this decade. As noted in Chapter 2, Institutional Resources, each of UAlbany’s leadership teams has pursued significant infrastructure improvements that successive administrations have advanced and brought to fruition. As noted above, this 1998 plan led to the building of the Boor Sculpture Studio and the Life Sciences Research Building. In addition, there has been a significant expansion of the Fuller Road campus, which houses the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering, as well as development of the East Campus, home to the School of Public Health and Cancer Research Center. Another welcome outcome of the Master Plan has been a multi-million dollar signage and entry-way improvement project funded from the New York State capital budget; this has significantly enhanced the University’s ability to attract and retain high quality faculty and students.

With eight America East conference championships and five teams in NCAA Tournament appearances, the 2006-07 season was UAlbany athletics’ most celebrated since the University moved to NCAA Division I level in 1999. Conference titles were won by men's basketball, volleyball, men's indoor track, baseball, softball, men's lacrosse, men's outdoor track, and women's outdoor track. The UAlbany Great Danes finished second in the America East Conference Commissioner’s Cup standings, a measure of overall sports success, in the closest margin of victory in conference history. Women’s indoor track and women’s lacrosse recorded runner-up finishes, bolstering UAlbany's Commissioner's Cup point total. In the 2006-07 season, UAlbany boasted 53 all-conference selections, while 46 student-athletes were named to conference all-academic teams. In 2007-08, 64 student athletes were all-conference selections, and 62 were honored as such in 2008-09. UAlbany’s NCAA Academic Progress Rate (APR)

\textsuperscript{1} Many UAlbany graduate program have been rated in the upper ranks by \textit{U.S. News and World Report}, the \textit{Princeton Review}, and \textit{Small Times} magazine.
across the 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08 academic years, has consistently been in the high 900s for its Division I sports offerings. In the most recently completed academic year at time of this writing, 2008-09, UAlbany won seven conference titles and placed two teams in NCAA tournaments, bringing the University’s total conference titles to 40, with 15 total NCAA tournament appearances since joining Division I in 1999.

As highlighted in the University’s 2000 Self-Study and the 2005 Periodic Review Report, UAlbany has consistently shown a strong commitment to providing needed support services for its students. Chapter 5, Institutional Effectiveness and the Assessment of Student Learning; Chapter 7, Student Support Services; Chapter 9, Educational Offerings and General Education; and Chapter 10, Related Educational Activities, all provide evidence that supporting the University’s students within and outside of the classroom is a demonstrated strength, aimed toward facilitating the future success of UAlbany students. From residence hall programming to the services provided by the Advisement Services Center, the Office of Academic Support Services and the Educational Opportunities Program (EOP), a variety of measures, such as the SUNY Student Opinion Survey (SOS), indicate that students perceive the support mechanisms they receive at UAlbany to be carefully designed and delivered to support student needs.

Most fundamentally, the University at Albany comprises exceptional faculty and staff, who deliver the academic programs, research, and service components of the institution’s mission. Their achievements have ensured the satisfaction of the Middle States standards of accreditation.

Nevertheless, the University has faced a number of challenges over the past decade, plus some issues the campus knows it needs to address as UAlbany moves into the next decade. First and foremost is the need to update the Mission Statement, which was originally developed in 1992. Similarly, the University needs to develop a new strategic plan, one that recognizes UAlbany’s accomplishments and achievements over the past decade, and focuses its efforts for the years to come. Over the past few years, as several individual units and University-wide committees (e.g., Information Technology Services, the Office of International Education, and the Steering Committee on Community Engagement) have developed focused strategic plans, the campus has become increasingly aware of the need for these plans to be integrated into a larger campus plan. While this is an issue that is raised most strongly in Chapter 2, Mission and Goals - Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal, it is clearly an issue central to the entire accreditation process and therefore salient across all standards.

Another general challenge confronting the University is the need to build upon current efforts to enhance assessment practices. While considerable progress has been made over recent years to promote a culture of assessment on campus, especially with respect to teaching and learning, assessment activities are uneven and inconsistent. Several chapters note the need to refocus attention on institutional assessment so that it can better inform planning and resource allocation. Assessment of administrative units has not been conducted in systematic and regular ways, due in part to the frequent turnover in senior leadership. The chapters below identify a number of additional areas where greater attention to assessment would be desirable. These include academic programs (e.g., interdisciplinary opportunities, internships, the Honors College, online courses), advisement policies (especially for the major and minor), and important services (such as the Writing Center and information technology).
An additional critical theme that emerges consistently in the chapters of the self-study is the need for better communication among the various stakeholders at the University. The decision-making processes by senior administrators pertaining to budgets and the allocation of resources have not always been made clear to faculty, staff, and students in a timely fashion. Frequent transitions in senior leadership have impeded the development of the kinds of trust and mutual expectations that facilitate effective, shared governance. Many in the University are largely unaware of the activities of key governing bodies, such as the SUNY-wide Senate, the SUNY Board of Trustees, and the University Council. Recommendations pertaining to these challenges are proposed below.

A final, more overarching challenge to the University is the need to foster a stronger sense of community. Analyses conducted for the self-study reveal many strengths and reasons for pride in UAlbany. Nevertheless, these analyses also suggest that the University is not doing as well as it could in recruiting and retaining high-performing students and outstanding faculty. Moreover, other research conducted by various units indicates that the University has not done a good job of publicizing its accomplishments; as a result, many faculty, staff, current students and UAlbany alumni, as well as members of the Capital Region community, are unaware of many of the accomplishments of the “UAlbany family.” Along with excellent academic programs, research opportunities, benefits, and infrastructure, an attractive and thriving university is one in which the various constituencies know about, identify with, are committed to, and are eager to support the institution at large.

Self-Study Design

The University at Albany’s stature and achievements have greatly accelerated over the self-study period (2000–present) through enhancements in educational and research opportunities, as well as student services, increased capital investment, upgrades to the recent Division I athletics program, and increased outreach and advancement efforts. The Middle States re-accreditation process was very much welcomed as a powerful opportunity to demonstrate the evidence behind the University’s continuing ascent to the upper echelons of American higher education.

Then-Interim President Philip directed the development of a comprehensive self-study design to best serve the University’s interests as the self-study was initially organized. The comprehensive model, as stated in the MSCHE “Self-Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report,” creates a useful process that “enables an institution to appraise every aspect of its programs and services, governing and supporting structures, resources, and educational outcomes in relation to the institution’s mission and goals.” This approach was initially chosen because Interim President Philip expected that it would be particularly beneficial in informing the next president about the many aspects of the complex organization that is the University at Albany. In order to maximize the efficiency of the working groups, given UAlbany’s historical institutional culture and organizational relationships between faculty and the administration, some accreditation standards were grouped together in the formal self-study design, resulting in nine working subcommittees in all. The nine subcommittees are:
• Mission and Goals - Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal
• Institutional Resources
• Leadership, Governance and Administration (including the Libraries and ITS)
• Institutional Assessment and Assessment of Student Learning
• Student Admissions and Retention
• Student Support Services
• Faculty
• Educational Offerings - General Education
• Related Educational Activities

It is important to note that the University’s last accreditation occurred in 2000, six years prior to the publication of the current MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, which delineates the newly adopted accreditation standards by which UAlbany will be judged. That said, the University was cognizant of anticipated changes in accreditation standards, as well as the new emphases on assessment processes that emerged in the 2002 edition of Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education. It also took note of the added emphasis that Middle States now places on the use of assessment results to inform decision-making across the institution and to evaluate student learning objectives.

The University developed an institutional assessment plan prior to its 2005 Periodic Review Report (PRR) to MSCHE; it began substantive assessment of learning outcomes in both the major and in its General Education program in the early 2000s; it continued to support them through senior leadership transitions, as noted below; and it incorporated assessment processes across administrative and academic units in the Compact Planning process instituted in the 2005-06 academic year, and abides by them at this writing. At the time that the self-study process was initiated in 2007, UAlbany had been without a permanent president since President Hall’s untimely death in August 2006. As noted above, this was another reason to inventory and assess the many aspects of UAlbany in preparation for the planning processes and action agenda of the next president. The comprehensive model was also seen as eminently adaptable should a new president be chosen sooner rather than later, and could be modified to focus on particular areas of emphasis should the eventual new president deem that approach desirable. As noted below, Interim President Philip, who gave the Self-Study Steering Committee its charge in June 2008, later was named the 18th President of the University. President Philip reviewed the work of the nine subcommittees and their progress, and re-endorsed the comprehensive self-study design

Specific Goals and Objectives

Over the past decade, the University at Albany has experienced the vicissitudes of state financial support and frequent transitions in the upper levels of its administration. President Philip, in consultation with the University Council and the University Senate, has looked upon the Middle States’ self-study process as a timely opportunity to review thoroughly all units of the University, to examine its goals, and to examine how it will continually assess progress toward achieving those goals. As noted above, it has been 10 years since the development of the last formal strategic plan, and the University is now under the direction of its sixth chief executive over this time span. As the Steering Committee undertook this self-study, it was anticipated that the next president would wish to initiate a comprehensive strategic planning process, and
President Philip announced the initiation of just such a process on Oct. 15, 2009, at the fall 2009 faculty meeting. A primary objective of this self-study, as noted by President Philip, is to inform that process. While the execution of the University’s self-study has certainly helped to identify areas of weakness, it is as important that it be viewed by University leadership and the campus community as an opportunity to identify areas of resilience and fortitude as well.

As such, this self-study process began with a goal to produce a comprehensive and forthright reflection on the current state of the University, with the expectation that the resulting document and recommendations would strengthen the unity of the community, giving it greater insight and renewed purpose for carrying out its mission in the decades ahead. The specific goals and objectives of the self-study, as outlined in the self-study design, were:

1. To examine and assess the state of the institution’s current mission, goals, policies, procedures, structures, educational and related offerings and activities, research, teaching, assessment mechanisms, and resources.
2. To empower a broad University constituency to participate in all aspects of the self-study process, ensuring the maximum representation of various constituencies within the University, as well as ownership of the process, its contents, and resulting recommendations.
3. To identify the institution’s strengths and weaknesses relative to each of the accreditation standards, in light of the University’s mission and goals.
4. To make specific recommendations for improvement, particularly in assessment, planning, and resource allocation processes.

Initially, the Steering Committee asked each of the nine subcommittees to complete the following activities to accomplish these goals and objectives:

1. Review their general charges, the Middle States’ standards of accreditation, and their respective charge questions.
2. Further revise, expand, and refine their respective charge questions through the course of their examinations, and with input from various facets of the University community.
3. Inventory and utilize major reports and planning documents, and information generated within each vice presidential area and the schools and colleges, to support analyses and conclusions.
4. Gather additional data and information, as needed, to address issues of interest.
5. Conduct interviews, focus groups or surveys, as needed, to support the information needs of the self-study process.
6. Communicate and be responsive to the broader University community in addressing issues of import throughout the self-study process, culminating in a final self-study document built through consensus and shared understanding.
Conclusion

The University at Albany is currently at an important point of transition. Its remarkable 165-year history, beginning with its roots as a normal school, is one of repeated challenges and of exceptional faculty, staff and students, who, in meeting those challenges, have transformed UAlbany into the major research university it is today. While it is tempting to try to share with external audiences many of the remarkable achievements of the past decade, despite the challenges associated with frequent changes in senior leadership and an austere funding environment, the Self-Study Steering Committee is well aware of the admonition of the Middle States document, “Self-Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report:” wherein it is made clear that “[t]he primary purpose of the self-study report is to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement,” and that the Self-Study report “is most useful when it is analytical and forward-looking rather than descriptive or defensive, when it is used both to identify problems and to develop solutions to them, and when it identifies opportunities for growth and development.”

The University at Albany therefore embarked on this process with an explicit goal of being honest with itself. The chapters that follow present the institution’s best attempt to examine how successful it is today at meeting the accreditation standards and, where weaknesses are identified, to make specific recommendations for strengthening the campus’s capacity to address them. The context of each recommendation is provided within the chapter in which it is presented, and each chapter concludes with a summary that gathers the recommendations made earlier. As will become evident upon review, the nine self-study subcommittees took their charges seriously and provided numerous recommendations based on the evidence provided, and their analyses. In the coming months, the University, with the advice of the Middle States review team, and in consideration of the guidance that will be recommended by the Strategic Planning Committee, will need to prioritize and selectively pursue action items from the many important recommendations made in this self-study document.
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%2012-09.pdf
\(^3\) https://wiki.albany.edu/download/attachments/9896187/1998+Strategic+Plan+with+Hitchcock+Letter.pdf?version=1
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.

“Africa excellence at all levels – faculty research, graduate training and undergraduate education – is the goal for the University at Albany,” says MRI. 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.

---

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\(^{10}\) 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.\(^{11}\)

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.  

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.
APPENDICES

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
Chapter 3: Institutional Resources

The objective of this chapter is to document and assess for adequacy, efficiency, effectiveness and transparency, the University at Albany’s methods for analyzing resource availability and allocating resources among its constituent parts. One difficulty in achieving this goal is the high turnover of administrators at all levels within the University over the last decade, as described in the introductory chapter of this self-study. As a consequence of high level administrative turnover, there have been many changes in the procedures over time with respect to the allocation of resources within the University, as successive officers placed their stamp or preference upon the methodology used. The following narrative does not attempt to document all of these changes over the past decade, but to focus more on current practice as well as some of the resource-planning initiatives that have been used in the recent past.

This chapter includes, a) a description of University resources, b) prediction of resource availability, and c) a description of the allocation procedures and policies. The description of the allocation procedures are based on the current organization of the University (Appendix 3.2). The resource allocation and decision-making processes will be described for a) the University level (presidential-provost), b) the divisions of Research and Information Technology Services, c) two colleges, Arts and Sciences and Education, as well as the Libraries, who report to the provost, and d) Facilities, Institutional Controls and Audits. Not all units of the University are included due to space limitations. The units included were chosen on the basis of size, and/or importance, as well as the proportion of the University population served. The committee gathered information on the University’s institutional resources by interviewing a variety of administrators at various levels of the University. Due to the history of the University at Albany administration, current procedures are not well documented, hence the ethnographic approach. In addition, Compact Planning documents, the Going Forward Plan, and the University’s organizational chart informed the analysis of this chapter.

Description of University Resources

The distribution of the University at Albany’s state funding over the self-study period is presented below. The combination of state tax support and tuition forms what SUNY refers to as the core instructional budget. 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, direct state tax support provides just over half (54%) of the total state appropriated budget.
The University also receives special state appropriations, titled above “Other State Appropriations,” which are designated for specific purposes, and may include specific legislative appropriations that cannot be re-allocated without an action by the NYS Legislature. Funds generated external to the core instructional budget and regulated as state dollars are administered through Special Revenue fund income accounts, and expenditures from these accounts are typically restricted for the purpose for which the revenue was generated. “Special Revenue” funds encompass the University’s self-supporting monies generated from research activity, dormitory operations as well as revenues which must be spent on student housing and student programming, and income fund reimbursable operations. “University Auxiliary Services” funds encompass dollars generated and used by University Auxiliary Services (UAS), a not-for-profit corporation established to provide quality of life services (e.g., dining services, bookstore, laundry, etc.) to the University at Albany community. Dollars generated through Facilities and Administrative (F&A) rates charged to external grants and contracts administered by the Research Foundation comprise the RF Grant categories in the chart above. Return of indirect costs from research grants accounts for only 3% of total University funds. Of the remaining monies, as noted in Chapter 2, 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%). Clearly, the large proportion of fixed expenditures makes it difficult to develop new initiatives and/or to plan strategically.

Predicting Resource Availability

The University at Albany suffers from many of the same constraints concerning institutional resources as other state-supported universities. In particular, the institution has no control over the level of direct state support, or for that matter, tuition levels. Only the SUNY Board of Trustees is authorized to set tuition; however, New York State legislative action is required in order to spend the tuition dollars the University collects. The level of state tax support SUNY receives is part of the NYS budget process requiring executive branch recommendation and legislative approval. The approved funding levels are then disbursed by the New York State executive branch. There is no specific campus within the State University of New York system which attempts to predict the level of state tax support in advance. This would be a complicated undertaking, given that aspects of politics, as well as economics (such as the recent decline in the economy), is intertwined in determining the level of state support. Research funds are more predictable; however, they are largely dedicated to specific faculty-initiated and staff-initiated projects. Only the return of indirect costs helps support the University’s specific operating costs.

Allocation Procedures

The President and Provost Level

Resource planning and decision-making at the University at Albany has varied over the last decade due to the turnover in administrations. The 2000 Middle States report described a
“Strategic Planning Process,” which was under development at that time. Six “Strategic Goals” were eventually defined. Planning was largely decentralized and carried out at the departmental and college levels, and then reviewed by the University Resources and Priorities Advisory Committee (URPAC) of the University Senate for congruence with the stated strategic goals. Final recommendations were then made to President Karen Hitchcock.

Compact Planning, begun in 2005 under President Hall, was considerably more complex than prior processes. There was funding designated to support both recurring base commitments for new faculty lines as well as one-time temporary funding for special initiatives. The campus goal was to fund 100 new faculty lines over a five-year period. Since state funding to the University was expected to remain basically flat during this period, the Compact Plans were to be funded by increasing enrollment. Departments and administrative units developed proposals which were then negotiated up-line and eventually bundled into final proposals at college and vice presidential unit levels. School/college and vice presidential proposals were reviewed by the Selective Investment Committee, consisting of mostly senior faculty and staff, which then made recommendations to the president. The committee explicitly considered the earlier strategic goals when reviewing compacts. The resulting compacts were contractual agreements between the units in question and the University. Both costs and deliverables were defined and they incorporated an assessment component. Although President Hall passed away in 2006 before the initial Compact Planning process was fully completed, a second round of awards was made the next year under the rubric of Selective Investment by then Officer-in-Charge Herbst. Over the two years, 30 new faculty positions were funded and nearly $2 million in one-time initiatives were funded. Full-scale assessments of the various compacts were never carried out as the Compact Planning and Selective Investment processes were discontinued after the first two rounds by Officer in Charge Herbst.

In the case of Compact Planning, the actual planning was complex, interactive, relatively transparent, and engaged all levels of the University. It was also extremely time-consuming for all involved. The decision-making process was centralized, assuring efficiencies for the University as a whole. Subsequent distributions of resources at the University level (presidential and provostial) were incremental, based on the previous year’s budget allocation. The office of the provost currently has little flexibility with respect to funding. In the past some cost savings from retirements and resignations returned to the provost for reallocation. Currently, all lines remain within the colleges while lines in the remaining administrative and support units within Academic Affairs are at the discretion of the provost, with more autonomy afforded the University Libraries. Similar to the colleges, the Libraries retain the full base value of the lines, however 25% of the savings from any vacant line in the Libraries reverts to the provost for one-time investment. Previously, the provost retained 100% of vacant line-savings in the Libraries, as it continues to do with other Academic Affairs support units. As discussed in the preceding chapter, these monies can and are moved from unit to unit based on one-time need; however, the permanent value of the vacant lines remains with the unit. In general, temporary and base funds are not moved from unit to unit because they are necessary to maintain the function of the unit. Thus, both the planning and any decision-making process of resource allocation have been decentralized and now reside in the colleges and administrative units. Unfortunately, this means there is little or no incentive for cooperation among the colleges and administrative units, and the potential exists for a general loss of efficiency at the university level. It is recommended that
some means of coordinating planning and resource allocation among the colleges and administrative units be instituted to ensure efficiencies of purpose and use of resources.

Typically, each February, the colleges and administrative units are asked for hiring and resource reallocation plans for the following academic year, and then these plans are discussed with the provost, president, and chief financial officer at a budget meeting in March or April. In the last year (2008-09), state resources have contracted and units have been asked to reduce their budget plans incrementally. Given the current New York State budget, additional reductions will take place in the 2009-10 academic year. In 2009, then Interim President George Phillip formed the Budget Advisory Group (BAG), consisting of faculty and staff, to provide advice concerning how to handle the looming budget cuts. To date, only very general results of these deliberations have been shared with the University community (Appendix 3.4). More recently, Provost Susan Phillips has convened a budget panel of faculty, including some members of the president’s BAG, to advise her concerning the eminent budget shortfall within the division of Academic Affairs. The general deliberations of this latest group were concluded in June 2009 (Appendix 3.5). In an effort to keep the campus community informed on the general budget issue, a Website containing budget issues has been made available to the general faculty and staff. However, the contents to this point contain few specifics, due to the timing and speed of the budget reduction. Subsequently, this process was compressed, and no actions were taken during the summer when campus participation is limited.

Resource planning and decision-making at the university level over the past 10 years has varied as a result of the turnover of administrations. The changing practices of these administrations, variation in enrollment versus research as a means of leveraging resources, and current use of an incremental budgeting process have left the University at Albany in a poor position. Lack of clear goals at the university level and decentralization of planning and decision-making among the colleges with respect to resources is likely to reduce efficiencies and hamper any university-wide initiatives and goals. The Going Forward Plan is a start toward addressing these concerns. However, the University must begin the process of redefining its mission and goals and reinstituting a transparent resource-planning and decision-making process. Immediate efforts to deal with the impending budget crises have included faculty and staff in advisory roles. A specific proposal has not yet been released.

It is recommended that some means of coordinating planning and resource allocation among the colleges and administrative units be instituted to increase efficiencies and reinforce University-wide initiatives and goals. UAlbany’s incremental budgeting processes should be revisited with an eye toward better aligning the University with its strategic goals. Now that stable leadership has emerged with the appointment of President Philip in June 2009, the process of redefining the University’s mission and goals, and reinstituting a transparent resource-planning and decision-making process, should be high priorities.

**Research Resources**

The interim vice president for Research currently reports to the president through the provost. The Office for Research mission can be appreciated in the vice presidential goals for 2008-09:
- Increase total number of research applications in all units
- Increase federal research awards in all units, especially in the life sciences
- Increase funding for research infrastructure
- Consider approval for new research centers and institutes
- Continue opportunities for mentored student research
- Improve science facility business management
- Produce an annual research report
- Enhance delivery of research ethics and conflict of interest training
- Plan for the animal research program
- Continue COEUS implementation and possibly expanding modules
- Provide technology development support for faculty inventions

**Office for Research Budget**

The aforementioned goals are achieved by an Office for Research Budget. The operating budget for the office comes primarily from two sources: state funds (44%) and indirect cost-recovery (56%). Nearly 20% of the total budget available to the research office is used to support and incentivize the research activity on campus. Included in this 20% are the ICR funds returned to the departments as well as funds used to support the Faculty Research Awards program.

The vice president for Research meets with each head of the units under the charge of that office to determine the needs for the coming year; any requests for new staffing or other items are submitted to the vice president for review. Decisions are made based upon past unit performance, which is assessed as described below. The Council on Research, a governance body of the University that reports to the University Senate, serves as an advisory body to the vice president, who informs and consults the Council on budget allocations and priorities.

The Office for Research uses several criteria to determine the effectiveness of the allocations in previous years. The vice president meets with the directors of centers and deans to review the three-year performance in terms of funds expended versus grants applications made and grants awarded. Particular emphasis is placed on federal grants, as these bring in a higher amount of Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) dollars that generate additional funds for incentive/development. The performance of each research center and institute is evaluated periodically by the Council on Research. Its report goes to the vice president for Research. The performance of the University in obtaining research funding is compared to that of peer institutions in order to evaluate overall success.

In addition, the vice president for Research has set specific priorities for preserving and developing the strengths in particular areas. Historically strong research areas of the University, atmospheric sciences, public policy and social sciences, will continue to receive support. A goal is to facilitate cross-translational research between nanoscale sciences and engineering and the life sciences, both of which have been traditionally supported by the University. Emerging areas of research excellence include cancer research and RNA science and technology.
Research Support for the University

The University’s traditional strengths and its location relative to the seat of state government have encouraged a large research portfolio portion that includes NYS programs. These do not provide the higher ICR that is realized with federal research grants. Federal-sponsored grants made directly to the campus can in theory provide over 50 cents in indirect costs for each dollar of direct costs, although the actual ICR realized may be less than the negotiated rate. Federal grants that are part of legislative appropriations or non-federal grants, including state appropriations grants, provide much less (i.e., less than 20%). The amount of ICR which is retained by the campus is reduced by an assessment made by the Research Foundation. The Research Foundation taxes the University ICR at the same rate regardless of the sponsor-allowable indirect cost rate.

The Research Foundation assesses at a rate of 3% of the prior three-year weighted average (20%, 30%, 50%) of the total direct and indirect activity at the campus. This assessment then reduces the projected current year ICR which is available to the University to support sponsored program activity. Thus, the effective ICR obtained through University negotiations with sponsoring agencies is less after application of this tax and varies with the proportion of different sponsored grants. Also, since the total grant award is used as the basis, the sponsored awards with lower indirect-cost returns affect in a negative way the cost-recovery necessary to administer the infrastructure for all awards, and also contribute to a greater assessment of those grants which do receive appropriate cost-recovery.

As inferred above, it should be noted that the unique research portfolio of the campus leans heavily toward public policy and social sciences and, while this provides an invaluable service to federal, state and local governments, these grant activities traditionally provide for less indirect cost-recovery than the sciences. For example, the average overall ICR rate in the social sciences, based on over $114 million in direct expenditures over the past four fiscal years, has been 22%, while the physical and life sciences returned a rate of 27% from a base of just over $47 million during this time period. External awards in education returned ICR at the 22% rate from four-year direct expenditures of $26 million; while generated from a considerably smaller funding base, computer and information sciences and mathematics and statistics generated ICR rates of 13% and 19%, respectively. Training grants, largely funded by New York State through the University’s Professional Development Program (PDP), totaled just over $98 million in direct expenditures over the past four years and had an average ICR rate of 16%. The methodology used by the Research Foundation to determine the ICR assessment does not acknowledge disciplinary differences nor the ICR rates that grant sponsors pay, and consequently a larger percentage of the University’s indirect cost-recovery is assessed by the Research Foundation — in effect penalizing UAlbany for providing these partnerships with the State that are funded by both state and federal flow-through funds. Efforts should be made in the strategic planning process to seek a solution from SUNY and the Research Foundation to this problem so that this worthy research activity, which engages communities both near and far to UAlbany, is not deemphasized due to insufficient resources.

While non-state grant activity, particularly federal grants, need to be expanded, as the ICR rates are critical to supporting the research infrastructure and pursuing research goals, UAlbany has an
important role in providing teaching, outreach and training for the professional workforce and greater community. A dialogue must be continued with SUNY and the Research Foundation so that this value-added role of the University to New York and the world will not be overshadowed by what appears to be disproportionately high overhead charges relative to the complexity of the various ICR rates.

**Information Technologies**

The IT landscape on the campus has undergone many changes since 2000. In late 2001, based upon a peer review recommendation, the position of chief information officer (CIO), with a direct reporting line to the president, was created, and the major technology units, reporting to different vice presidential areas, were reassigned to the CIO. In 2002, the CIO reorganized these units to form the Information Technology Services (ITS) unit. In addition to the central ITS unit, there is a web of distributed technology support individuals in the schools and colleges, known as technology coordinators (TCs). The TCs report to their Deans, provide desktop support, as well as support for departmental labs and classrooms and, in some instances, server-based services. Resources for technical projects and staffing may come from central IT or the schools and colleges. The TCs and staff from central IT meet monthly, both to share information and coordinate projects of common interest.

The ITS Mission Statement and seven core planning principles were derived in 2002 out of an open process that included, in addition to IT, representatives of stakeholder groups. In 2003 a set of eight strategic goals were adopted. The result of the 2005 Compact Planning initiative was a set of five major areas of concentration for IT. A new round of strategic planning has just begun for ITS. Initially internal, at the environmental scanning stage, the process will in turn engage stakeholders and advisory groups. IT governance takes input from advisory groups that include the IT Policy Review Board, Student Advisory Board, Faculty Advisory Board, the Information Security Council, and various standing committees and project groups, such as the Library and Information Systems Council of the University Senate, Integrated Administrative System Steering Committee, Classroom Committee, Data Center Advisory Committee, Technology Coordinators Forum and Information Commons Taskforce. Input from administrative divisions on campus comes from VP-CIO meetings.

Fiscal considerations are recognized during, but do not drive, the planning process. Annually, an operating plan is developed, which takes into account budget realities. Project progress and priorities are assessed at quarterly reviews. Priority-setting takes into consideration mandates and risk mitigation, plus the need to maintain current services, make improvements and even retire services. While the IT services portfolio grows every year, the ITS budget has not. With the University using the perpetual budget allocation model, despite base-budget cuts, units are expected to keep services going with historical levels of funding.

Efficiency and cost benefit are themes underlying the deployment of infrastructure and services. Fiscal conditions necessitate a constant awareness of affordability of services. The ITS base budget for other than personnel service (OTPS) has been declining since 2001. A large portion of OTPS monies are designated within ITS for licenses, contractual arrangements and maintenance.
Open source applications are often deployed. There is a base budget for the cyclic (five-year) replacement of server hardware, but none for other infrastructure or classrooms.

Therefore, many IT initiatives are supported by one-time funding. Emergencies, one-time expenses and project start-up costs have been handled with a small contingency fund; this fund was given up in the latest round of budget cuts, thereby eliminating future flexibility.

Capital projects, or ITS one-time funding, provide for initial outfitting of classroom technology. To have all registrar-scheduled classrooms outfitted with installed technology is a goal of the campus Classroom Committee. Currently the University is at 58% installed technology in those rooms, and if capital funding remains in place, planning will proceed to make significant progress towards the goal over the next five years; this will include opening Husted Hall on the Downtown Campus in early 2010, thereby providing fully-fitted technology in every one of the classrooms in this dedicated instructional building. This is a very slow process relative to faculty demand and compared to peer institutions. Schools and colleges outfit classrooms that are managed by individual departments. Across campus, there is no base-cyclic replacement funding for classroom technology; replacements are paid for from one-time money and are done on a “most critical” basis, which makes planning difficult. It is important to note that the University’s current capital plan includes approximately $30 million to relocate and modernize the primary data center. The relocation will allow UAlbany to meet modern computing needs, housed in a facility that can efficiently handle the space, cooling and power demands.

Staffing levels in ITS peaked in 2004 with the addition of three positions and the formation of a Research IT unit to address an unmet need of campus researchers. Recent budget reductions have been met in part by eliminating staff positions. ITS’s approach to budget reductions is always to minimize the impact on direct services to students, faculty and staff. For example, staff positions were reduced in the Data Center through staff retirements and attrition, but the impact was lessened by the use of technology, (e.g., remote alarms) and new emergency-response coordination with Central Plant’s 24-hour office. However, if problems occur when systems are unattended, there exists a risk that the duration of service interruptions would be greater.

The CIO controls any vacancies that occur in the subunits of ITS and regularly moves empty lines between departments, based on programmatic priority and resource needs. Changes in ITS staff composition have involved redeployment of vacant positions, resulting in the creation of an information security office (ISO) position, a Faculty Technology Resources group (FTR) and the hiring of dedicated help desk staff. The work of the ISO has helped ensure that no major security breaches have occurred at the University. The FTR group has a mission to support faculty instructional needs. A continued growth in the usage of the Blackboard Learning System (BLS) has been seen with nearly 800 courses using it for the spring 2009 semester. The ITS HelpDesk regularly handles an average of 2,000 contacts every month. With the recent deployment of service desk software, the HelpDesk has become a one-stop service center for all technology-related services. Anticipated benefits include improved customer service, more efficient internal management, and better metrics for planning.

Assessment and evaluation of services are accomplished in several ways. Customer satisfaction is addressed through customer-initiated feedback via email, the Web, and at customer service
points, and through solicited customer-feedback short surveys or face-to-face conversation, advisory groups, or town hall meetings. There is a public Write-to-the-CIO mailbox. Meetings with divisions, VPs and departmental representatives provide continual feedback. The SUNY Student Opinion Survey solicits student satisfaction about broad-based technology issues. ITS internally assesses services through HelpDesk metrics and service utilization statistics, as well as cost/benefit/affordability reviews and comparisons with external alternatives and peers. The Educause Core Data Service and the Campus Computing Project, as well as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the Educause Center for Applied Research (ECAR) student survey, provide valuable insights and comparison data points regarding industry trends.

The Student Advisory Board is one of the most influential groups in evaluating service offerings for students and determining service improvements. Members are invited to submit agenda items for meetings, and ITS follows up on questions/comments. These reinforce ITS’s commitment to transparency, service improvement and the creation of a positive IT experience for students. At their recommendation the following services have been implemented: s-drive for file space; the Information Commons(IC), including the addition of MACs; remote access to IC software from any location via a Web browser; and printing from wireless and student email aliases. The Student Advisory Board was also instrumental in previewing functionality developed in the student MyUAAlbany portal. It has provided feedback on the campus Website, cable TV and library services as well. ITS has heard student comments about how they wish all courses would use BLS and has diligently worked to make BLS and associated tools a valuable instructional resource.

There have been three external assessments of IT services over the self-study period. One, conducted in 1999-2000, presented the recommendation that the campus hire a CIO. SunGard did a second survey in 2006. A recent study was commissioned by the CIO and VP for Finance and Business to assess the state of the main Data Center located in CS-5. This study confirmed that the existing center had many problems and could not meet future University needs; it made the case for a new Data Center and served as the basis to secure capital funding for a data center project that is proceeding.

The Committee was impressed with the ability of ITS to maintain core infrastructure services and respond to increased campus needs for technology solutions despite the decline in its base budget. However, the elimination of the contingency fund and the corresponding reduction in flexibility is a cause for concern. It will reduce the ability of ITS to explore and prototype emerging technology solutions and implement new services.

It is recommended that support for continued investment in classroom technology and the development of cyclic replacement for classrooms be developed. A review should be undertaken of the efficiency and possible duplication of services under the current central IT and TC-distributed support model.

While IT clearly uses informal means of gathering input from stakeholders regarding services and support, ITS should develop more formal means of assessment, such as the development of benchmarks to measure against and the use of more formal and regular means of assessment.
The College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and Resource Issues

Different schools and colleges have different budget processes. This and the next section focus on the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), due to its size, and the School of Education, which is one of several professional schools within the University. The schools, colleges, and the University Libraries report to the provost. CAS has an “all funds” budget of about $40 million, approximately 93% of which is “fixed” costs provided by New York State for salaries and operating expenses. Historically, there is almost no change in the amount of these monies that CAS receives each year. Yearly, each dean reviews the budget and allocation plan for their unit with the provost. In CAS, these monies are distributed across 23 departments, three support units and several CAS-based centers, based upon incremental budget allocations. Any salary savings or unexpended funds (due to sabbaticals, retirements, etc) are redistributed to departments that have additional instructional needs (as partial lines), or used to support faculty travel and/or computer replacement. Open faculty lines remain in CAS and are redistributed among departments and units by the dean, usually within a year of becoming open. An overall assessment of program needs is ongoing between the dean and department and unit chairs.

CAS’s “discretionary funds” consist of donations (e.g., from the University at Albany Foundation) and returns from indirect costs from grant activity (ICR). The decision process for distributing CAS discretionary funds is limited due to the small amount of available monies. Some “discretionary funds” are dedicated support for endowed scholarships or lecture series and are not in fact discretionary. “Unrestricted” UAF funds donated to the dean’s office are reallocated based upon requests made by the individual departments or planned needs for the upcoming year. Reallocations are also based upon an assessment of last year’s expenditures (e.g., refreshments for College events and meetings). Use of departmental unrestricted funds (donations to departments) is determined by each individual department; the process used to make these decisions is oftentimes informed by departmental by-laws.

Research Foundation funds, in the format of indirect cost return (ICR), are used to support and encourage additional research projects and grant writing activities. CAS’s Faculty Development Committee of the Faculty Council reviews small grants and makes recommendations to the dean concerning funding. In any typical year, $30,000-35,000 in ICR funds are available to the dean. Departments also receive their own ICR allocations based on grant activity. Similar to UAF discretionary funds, departments determine the use of these departmental allocations.

The process for planning and assigning teaching and instructional resources in CAS has historically used a “collaborative model,” a process reinforced with policies, instructions and teaching templates published in the college’s Department Chair Manual. Basic tenets followed in the distribution and prioritizing of CAS teaching resources include: 1) meeting with the University’s budget office to determine the amount of money in the budget for teaching and instructional resources, 2) meeting with University Enrollment Management personnel to determine the number of incoming students and the estimated number of courses needed and taught by CAS instructors for the year ahead (this includes General Education courses and courses for transfer students needing CAS major and minor program support), 3) looking at projected overall CAS-supported course enrollments and adjusting teaching assignments (including GA and TA assignments) according to student need, program objectives, research
support and strength of program. Chairs work closely with their faculties concerning teaching (i.e., program) needs. Full-time CAS faculty members are assigned courses first; then, any remaining unassigned courses are backfilled and assigned to teaching assistants and, if need be, to part-time faculty.

CAS uses several assessment tools to determine if teaching resources are assigned and implemented effectively, included but not limited to: detailed enrollment trend analysis that examines historical enrollments by class, faculty member, and department; program reviews; national benchmarks (for guidance and comparison); graduation rates; time to degree; student satisfaction surveys; and teaching evaluations.

Adequacy of current teaching resources is marginal. If there is a significant enrollment spike of incoming freshmen and transfer students for the upcoming year, there are no teaching-resource contingency funds available in the college. For the coming year, CAS has been allocated additional one-time funds for instruction to meet the expected instructional need. This additional allocation has occurred over the past several years as well, as enrollments have outpaced allocated resources.

The process for planning and assigning resources related to research in CAS is driven mostly from policies and directives out of the University’s Office for Research, the Research Foundation, and from sponsors/providers of targeted research grants. However, the University and research office also provide a limited amount of funds for research activities within the college and leave the process for distribution of these funds to the dean, Faculty Council, FRAP award committee and/or to the departments, which may provide matching funds. When the Life Sciences Research Building was opened in 2005, an allocation was established to cover the costs of maintenance, phones, service contracts, etc., and an account was established for CAS to manage these expenses.

The assistant dean/chief administrative officer of CAS is responsible for internal monitoring and assessment of funds allocated to all 23 departments. Externally, the University, VP for Research and the Research Foundation budget offices provide guidance on proper fund expenditures; they also monitor and audit all research fund accounts.

**School of Education**

The School of Education has two forms of funding: fixed funding, which consists largely of non-discretionary funding, including endowment income; and grant-funding, which provides a return on indirect costs. The School has a number of endowed scholarships. The remaining discretionary resources are partly assigned to special projects and partly kept in reserve to respond to specific needs as they arise.

Within the School of Education, the process of resource allocation was described by the interim dean of the school as a transparent one, in which there is communication along supervisory lines at all levels. Decision-making is carried out by the dean, upon consultation with the department chairs. Likewise, there is a line of communication between the dean and the University’s provost. The dean meets with department chairs both on an individual basis and as a leadership
team when considering resource allocation, including redistribution of open faculty lines. Resources, such as merit raises and support for special projects and initiatives, including support for conference presentations that would support the mission of the school, are allocated based on assessments of factors such as need, merit, and benefit to the school. After resources have been allocated, follow-up is conducted regarding the impact of the resources provided.

Teaching resources for the School of Education include faculty lines as well as Teaching/Graduate Assistant lines. The School of Education, over the years, has valued the integration of adjunct faculty members to carry out teaching activities; as such, faculty members contribute a unique perspective from within the broader professional community. However, these adjunct faculty positions have had to be cut back, based on limited resources.

In large part, research within the School of Education is self-supporting through local, state, and federal grants. One of the University’s research institutes, the Albany Institute for Research in Education, is housed within the school and, while largely grant-supported, receives some financial support from the Office of the Dean, and from the vice president for Research. Competitive school-based research grants are available, but the amount of funding for such grants varies from year to year based on external dollars that are generated by school faculty. Faculty can also compete for somewhat larger, university-wide grants (FRAPs) from the vice president for Research when their applications are recommended by the school. Schools and colleges also have access to IFR funds generated from faculty buy-outs and other one-time income activities. All of the colleges and schools use such funds.

**Technology and Space Resources**

Recently, the technology within the Education Building, where the School of Education is housed, has been upgraded to include wireless internet access and several “smart classrooms.” The dean of the School has made it a priority to upgrade faculty computers every four years on a rotating basis, but such upgrades have not taken place this fiscal year due to funding limitations. The School of Education employs (directly) a full-time IT person. Additional staff are needed to fully meet the school’s needs.

The School of Education is working diligently to address the impact of a challenging economic environment. Administrators in leadership positions within the school work collaboratively to maximize the benefit of existing resources, and to adapt processes, such as assignment of classroom space, to respond to resource limitations.

In general, the colleges and schools have operated as independent units. Resource planning and decision-making is held by the deans in consultation with the Council of Chairs. In general, this organization has worked well, particularly for the traditional programs. Resource consideration for interdisciplinary programs, programs that cross colleges, or programs that are administered as a part of a larger department, are not ensured, given the current organization.
The Libraries

The University Libraries have four sources of funding: state funds allocated to the Libraries from the provost’s office and which constitute the Libraries’ base allocation; income fund reimbursable accounts, which capture revenue from fees for photocopying, printing, fines for late returns, etc.; endowments and donations that are the result of fundraising efforts; and grants. State funds constitute the largest source of funding.

Approximately 45% of the Libraries’ budget is expended for salaries, an equal amount for materials acquisitions, and 10% for temporary services, supplies and equipment, staff training, and professional development. The Libraries have faced serious budgetary challenges in recent years. In addition to campus-wide budget cuts, the Libraries’ budget stressors include:

- Inflation on materials. The cumulative inflationary rate for journals, which comprise about 80% of the Libraries’ materials expenditures, has skyrocketed 65.8% since FY01, while the acquisitions base budget has increased only 3.75%. As a result, the Libraries’ purchasing power of information resources has been seriously eroded.
- Endowment values. Most of the Libraries’ endowments support materials acquisitions, but they are small and do not yet yield much interest. In some cases their use is restricted by subject or format, limiting their ability to meet collecting needs.
- Cutbacks in NY State funding programs. The Libraries depend on annual grants from the New York State Department of Education to support acquisitions and preservation activities. Over the past two years these grants have been reduced, with further reductions expected for FY2011.
- Addition of new programs to the curriculum. New programs are not typically accompanied by funding to purchase library materials to support teaching and research. Consequently, the Libraries’ acquisitions budget must be spread across more subject areas, further limiting the number of information resources that can be purchased to support each.
- Increased need for and cost of training. Changes in the nature of the academic library services and collection have resulted in the ongoing need for staff to acquire new skills. While some training can be conducted locally and online, there is an ongoing need to invest in off-site training for staff.

From FY08 to FY09, the state funds allocated to the Libraries were reduced by approximately 7.6%. The Libraries coping strategies included reducing staffing and cutting acquisitions spending chiefly by cancelling journal and database subscriptions. Remaining shortfalls in the acquisitions budget were offset by a combination of additional one-time funding from the provost’s office and the use of salary savings on vacant library staff positions. The Libraries also reduced spending on equipment by deferring its PC equipment replacement plan and costs for acquiring books and journals by renegotiating with book jobbers and subscription agents. Further economies were realized by reducing staff reimbursement for professional travel and joining with other SUNY libraries to purchase electronic information resources as a consortium.
The Library Policy Group (LPG), consisting of the dean and director of Libraries and the associate library directors, are responsible for allocating all of the non-salary funds the Libraries receive. At the beginning of each fiscal year, LPG may adjust base-budget allocations for supplies, equipment, temporary service, training and other general operating funds to align them with anticipated needs. Further adjustments of these funds may be made throughout the year. However, the acquisitions base budget is used only for the acquisitions of materials. Throughout the year the Libraries may add funding to the acquisitions budget from such sources as salary savings, but state funding earmarked for acquisitions is never used to support other library operations or services.

The allocation and management of the acquisitions budget is the responsibility of the associate director for collections. These funds are allocated by subjects that correspond to the University’s academic departments. Subject allocations reflect historical patterns of spending, costs of materials, and patterns of use. Each academic department has a library faculty member assigned to it as a bibliographer or subject specialist. The bibliographers work with the faculty in their assigned departments to identify the books, journals and other types of information resources needed to support their research and teaching. When new money is available, they identify subjects-allocations requiring adjustment to reflect and support new programs and, when budget shortfalls are anticipated, they work with the departmental faculty to develop strategies to reduce spending.

Decisions to purchase and subscribe to information resources, both print and online, are informed by a variety of data. Qualitative data about information needs come in the form of input received at service desks, communications from faculty directly to their bibliographers about materials they need for teaching and conducting research, and feedback from students in the classes that librarians teach. Prior to renewing subscriptions to e-journal packages and databases and in order to inform budget-reduction strategies, bibliographers consult quantitative data, including use-statistics (for online resources), circulation data (for print resources), and pricing information. Data from LibQUAL+ indicate that faculty and graduate students want access to more journals, but budget issues have prevented the Libraries from expanding the collection. However, in response to preferences for electronic (as opposed to print) journals that were also expressed in LibQUAL+, the Libraries are migrating as many print subscriptions to electronic as possible.

Facilities

The 1998 Facilities Master Plan, as discussed in detail in Chapter 2, is a comprehensive, well-organized and long-term plan that underpins successive smaller plans focusing on major building systems, facilities maintenance, renovations, major and minor repairs, and landscape work. Ad hoc and standing committees, as well as the Advisory Planning, Architecture, and Aesthetics Committee (APAAC), guide projects and planned work. In 2002, the University prepared a facilities assessment report, which involved coordination and interviews with University department heads to assess each building’s need for maintenance and improvements. The report tallied a critical maintenance backlog exceeding $260 million. When the plan was expanded to include other program and upgrade needs, the total grew to approximately $1 billion.
Funding and capacity to endure extensive work are the limiting factors in carrying out University construction plans. New York State appropriations from tax collections and/or bonds sold by the State Construction Fund permit the construction of new academic buildings and renovations and improvements to existing ones. Through SUNY-wide funding earmarked by the State University Construction Fund, UAlbany will receive the second of five installments of $33.8 million dollars for maintenance and repair during the 2009-10 fiscal year. Additional state appropriations include $54 million for a new School of Business building, $30 million for the expansion of the Campus Center, and $5 million for campus revitalization — all as projected in the Campus Facilities Plan.

Enrollment growth and a need for swing space to expedite residence hall renovations have led to a shortage in housing for students. The University studied this shortfall and concluded 500 beds would meet out-year needs. A capital project is in the planning stages to build 500 beds in the southeast corner of the Uptown Campus. The University cannot, however, use the SUNY Construction Fund as a funding source. Room rental charges must fund both the cost of construction and debt service.

In addition to the availability of funds, facilities priorities are dictated and prioritized by the urgency of health and safety matters, the capacity to complete the project, and the need to maintain occupancy and operations during construction. Detailed scheduling and phasing minimize the disruptive effects of construction. Emergencies requiring immediate attention and repair on the aging Uptown and Downtown campuses precede planned work. Once emergencies are handled, planned work resumes. While aging is a constant, flexibility of plant staff and the Master Plan is underscored by the fact that projects are completed with an effort to minimize disruption and under limited funding.

Overall, the University at Albany’s facilities are maintained with professionalism, organization and efficiency.

With regard to capital and facilities investments, the 1998 Master Plan report was a planning blueprint for a long list of projects funded and constructed over the course of this self-study period. They include many notable and important campus buildings that demonstrate sustained accomplishments over the self-study period: 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; completion of the lighting master plan; improved signage across campus; a new graphics and signage manual to guide future signage development; a new campus-wide fire alarm system; and myriad 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 early 2010. As with the 1998 Master Plan, this effort will also be informed and led by the campus’s mission and goals.

**Audits**

The chief auditor reports directly to the President of the University. Within SUNY, only the four university centers and three medical colleges have an auditor as a member of the campus administration.
There are three major program-specific audits that occur at UAlbany on a regular basis: the Research Foundation audit, governed by the federal Department of Health and Human Services (which, as the cognizant federal agency for the Research Foundation, examines the use of externally funded grants and contracts); the OMB Circular related to financial aid funding to the University; and SUNY central administration audits, which generally occur about every four years, but can actually be more or less frequent.

There are additional audits required for smaller units within the University. The Office of the State Comptroller can come in any time it wishes to conduct an audit; these are random and unpredictable, an example being a recent audit of all SUNY campuses regarding space-leasing with private landlords. SUNY, the Research Foundation and the UAlbany Foundation each have annual independent financial audits; SUNY collects and consolidates all campus-entity-audited financial statements into the comprehensive SUNY financial statements; SUNY auditors verify approximately every five years that these audits are carried out, and that there is a signed contract stipulating the relationship with system administration. NCAA mandates that all Division I schools complete an annual financial audit, which is governed by NCAA rules; UAlbany’s athletic department hires an independent auditor to complete this audit, with findings going directly to the NCAA. In addition, occasional unusual circumstances require independent audits, e.g., outside funding agencies that will not accept OMB audit findings or that wish to focus specifically on a single project.

In general, the entity requiring the audit specifies the protocol for responding to audit findings. The University’s Audit office receives the findings and forwards them to the designated University administrator responsible for the area. This administrative office is responsible for developing and implementing the corrective action plan. This plan is written up and a copy is filed with the University’s audit office. Subsequent audits always examine the areas where there were previous findings to make sure remedies were put in place. The University’s audit office does not review corrective action plans and is not involved in implementation.

On the whole, managers take audits and findings very seriously and are conscientious about taking appropriate action. Overall audit teams report that UAlbany does a good job setting up generally accepted accounting procedures and is responsive to audit findings.

**Chapter Summary**

The adequacy, efficiency, effectiveness and transparency of the processes the University at Albany used to assess resource availability and the allocation of resources over the self-study period have sufficed during a period of leadership turnover and unstable state funding. The self-study process has been invaluable for shedding light on how the University has grappled with its numerous financial challenges over the past nine years, and for highlighting areas for attention going forward. The following recommendations are intended to strengthen the University’s approach to resource-planning and allocation.
APPENDICES

Appendix 3.1 Recommendations

Recommendations regarding Resource Planning:

- Some means of coordinating planning and resource allocation among the colleges and administrative units should be instituted to increase efficiencies and reinforce University wide initiatives and goals.

- The University’s incremental budgeting processes should be revisited with an eye toward better aligning the University with its strategic goals.

- Now that stable leadership has emerged with the appointment of a permanent president in June, 2009, the process of redefining the University’s mission and goals, and reorganizing a transparent resource-planning and decision-making process, should be high priorities.

Recommendations regarding Research funding:

- Non-state grant activity, particularly federal grants, should be expanded, as the ICR rates are critical to supporting the research infrastructure and pursuing research goals.

- The role of the SUNY Research Foundation, and what appear to be disproportionately high overhead charges relative to the ICR, should be reviewed and renegotiated, if possible.

Recommendations regarding IT services:

- Support for continued investment in classroom technology and the development of cyclic replacement for classrooms should be developed.

- A review should be undertaken of the efficiency and possible duplication of services under the current central IT and TC-distributed support model.

- While IT clearly uses informal means of gathering input from stakeholders regarding services and support, ITS should develop more formal means of assessment, such as the development of benchmarks to measure against and the use of more formal and regular means of assessment.

- There should be continuing and additional attention to the IT needs of the administrative systems used to produce financial reports and create budget models.
Appendix 3.2 Current Organization of UAlbany
Chapter 4: Leadership, Governance and Administration

Overview

The system of administration and governance at the University at Albany is tiered, involving the State University of New York and the University at Albany. The Policies of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York articulate the main components of this system.

The Board of Trustees appoints a chancellor, who functions as “the chief executive officer of the University” and who “may assign to the officers, faculty and staff of the University powers, duties and responsibilities vested in them by [Board of Trustees] Policies.” The “University Faculty” “shall be responsible for the conduct of the University’s instruction, research and service programs;” the SUNY-wide University Faculty Senate “shall be the official agency through which the University Faculty engages in the governance of the University,” and the “University representatives shall serve at the pleasure of the chancellor of the University.”

The SUNY Board of Trustees selects a Chief Administrative Officer of each college (in the case of the University at Albany, the president) who “shall be responsible to the chancellor and the Board of Trustees for, and shall administer, the college for which he or she serves, and shall promote its development and effectiveness.” A University Council at each college “shall exercise such powers as are provided for in the Education Law, subject to the general management, supervision, control, and approval of and in accordance with rules established by the State University Trustees. Consistent with the statutory responsibilities of such bodies, they shall develop and foster strong relationships between their institutions and local communities and promote campus and University interests.” The campus faculty “shall have the obligation to participate significantly in the initiation, development and implementation of the educational program.”

This chapter discusses the procedures and activities of (1) the Board of Trustees and the University Council (the institutional governing bodies), (2) the University Administration, and (3) faculty governance, in response to the charge questions posed to the Subcommittee on Leadership and Governance. The chapter draws on public documents in print or on Websites. The subcommittee interviewed, in person or by telephone, 11 current and former UAlbany presidents, provosts, and vice presidents. Three additional administrators responded to questions from the subcommittee in writing. The subcommittee interviewed, as a group, eight individuals who served as University at Albany Senate chairs from the period 2000 to the present, with one additional former Senate chair submitting a written response to questions. Written responses were received to questions from two leaders in student government. The document also uses the results of the Re-Accreditation Survey of faculty completed by the University in December 2008 as part of the self-study process. Three themes recur across the administrative and governance issues surfacing from the review of the documents, interviews, written responses, and survey results.

1 The re-accreditation survey results are available at https://wiki.albany.edu/display/middlestates/Re-Accreditation+Survey+Results. The survey was designed to address specific requests from various Self-Study subcommittees for additional information to answer their charge questions. Accordingly, the survey results, in and of themselves, should not be interpreted as summative evaluations of particular issues, programs, or offices.
First, the frequent changes in senior administration at the presidential and provost level since 2003 challenged administration and governance in several respects. The unexpected resignation of President Karen Hitchcock in October 2003 and the sudden death of President Kermit Hall in August 2006 were particularly notable events among several developments contributing to this instability. Criteria and systems for evaluating administrators shifted frequently; communication between administration and faculty governance operated in varying ways and perhaps helped undermine the development of stable expectations and working relationships; and it became difficult to establish a clear sense of direction at the University. These conditions certainly did not disable administration and shared governance, but they left them operating less effectively than they otherwise would have operated.

Second, despite the difficult circumstances, the routines of University administration and governance continued to operate reasonably smoothly, and in some areas quite well. For example, individuals interviewed by the subcommittee, including former presidents and provosts, said that they had been impressed by the high levels of individuals’ commitment to the University, and the ways in which core functions had been carried out consistently despite frequent administrative changes. During the period of the self-study, voting faculty were surveyed on their perceptions of the extent to which different units had fulfilled their functions effectively.

The following are the summary evaluative ratings of faculty expressing views of the:

- **SUNY Board of Trustees:** 12% satisfied or very satisfied; 36% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
- **University Council:** 19% satisfied or very satisfied; 16% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
- **University Administration:** 42% satisfied or very satisfied; 27% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
- **University Senate:** 28% satisfied or very satisfied; 18% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied

The faculty survey reported the following average levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, by faculty expressing views, concerning various support services.

- **Academic Support Services:** 53% satisfied or very satisfied; 12% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
- **Advisement Services Center:** 51% satisfied or very satisfied; 20% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
- **Career Services:** 51% satisfied or very satisfied; 15% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
- **University Counseling Center:** 61% satisfied or very satisfied; 5% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
- **Disability Resources Center:** 71% satisfied or very satisfied; 5% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
University Health Center: 57% satisfied or very satisfied; 8% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
Office of the Registrar: 70% satisfied or very satisfied; 8% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied
Office of Undergraduate Education: 64% satisfied or very satisfied; 9% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied

Third, the appointment in June 2009 of Nancy Zimpher as SUNY Chancellor and George Philip as permanent president of the University at Albany will help address many of the challenges discussed in this document. The appointment of two well-respected individuals to these key posts will provide a higher level of stability and sense of direction to the University than has existed in recent years.

Institutional Governing Bodies

State-operated SUNY campuses have two major governing bodies: the SUNY Board of Trustees (NYS Education Title 1 Article 8) and the University Council, which is a local “oversight board” as mandated by NYS Education Law Article 8 Section 356.

Functions and Effectiveness of Governing Bodies

SUNY Board of Trustees

The functions of the SUNY Board of Trustees are well-defined. SUNY System Administration is the administrative arm of the Board (www.suny.edu). Consequently, SUNY campuses generally engage with personnel in System Administration rather than directly with the Trustees. Similarly, when a SUNY campus proposes to add, extensively revise, or eliminate an academic program requiring approval or registration with the New York State Department of Education, the proposal is sent by the campus to the Office of the SUNY Provost. If the proposal is approved at that level, System Administration interacts as needed with NYSED’s Office of College and University Evaluation, which assures that programs offered for credit meet or exceed minimum quality standards.

The role and effectiveness of the Board of Trustees are not universally acknowledged. In the "Voting Faculty" survey, response to the question “I understand the functions and responsibilities of the SUNY Board of Trustees in advancing UAlbany’s mission and objectives,” 35% of the respondents chose “strongly disagree” or “disagree,” and 19% chose “neutral.” Just 35% chose “strongly agree” or “agree,” and 10% indicated “don’t know/not applicable.” When asked whether the Board of Trustees “functioned effectively in advancing UAlbany’s mission and objectives for the last ten years,” 36% of respondents chose “strongly disagree” or “disagree,” and 24% chose “neutral.” Just 12% chose “strongly agree” or “agree,” and 28% indicated “don’t know/not applicable.” It seems fair to note that the opinions the faculty have formed of the Board could have been based on perceived problems with that body during the period 2000-2006, as well as early actions of those Trustees that carried over into the self-study period.

---

2 BOT Policies, appendix and www.suny.edu/Board_of_Trustees/index.cfm
In contrast to the voting faculty survey response patterns, both administrators and faculty governance leaders interviewed understood the roles of Trustees. Senior administrators noted little interaction between Trustees and campus leaders, and felt the distance from the Trustees impeded campus efforts.

In much of the period covered by this self-study, there was turnover of SUNY System leadership. When state leadership changed in 2007, one result was significant changes in membership and leadership of the Board. Similarly, SUNY saw a succession of chancellors and interim chancellors between 2004 and 2009, when Chancellor Zimpher was appointed. The response of both faculty leaders and campus administrators seems strongly positive concerning these SUNY System changes.

**University Council**

The responsibilities of UAlbany’s University Council are clearly defined. Among faculty governance leaders and campus presidents who dealt with the Council during the self-study period, there was consensus that the body performed effectively. The full list of University Council functions is available at [www.albany.edu/council/powersduties.shtml](http://www.albany.edu/council/powersduties.shtml), but its two principal functions are oversight of matters related to student welfare and behavior and, when the occasion arises, recommending candidates for President of the University to the Board of Trustees. It also has several other responsibilities, including naming buildings and grounds and the care and custody of the property. The minutes of the University Council reflect the body's continuing scrupulous attention to student health and safety issues throughout the period. The Council also maintains, and every three years reviews and approves, an updated version of the *Community Rights and Responsibilities* booklet (available at: [http://www.albany.edu/judicial/docs/CRR%202009%20-%20FINAL.pdf](http://www.albany.edu/judicial/docs/CRR%202009%20-%20FINAL.pdf)).

The process by which members are selected is similar to that of the SUNY Trustees (nine of the ten members are appointed by the Governor, who also appoints one of them as Chair of the University Council. The tenth member is elected by the student body). As a local practice, the Vice Chair of the Senate, an alumni representative, and a graduate student representative selected by the Graduate Student Organization are invited to the meetings in the roles, as recounted by the past Senate Chairs-elect, of “observers.” Currently, six members are UAlbany alumni.

Former Chair George Philip stepped down upon becoming Interim UAlbany President in November 2007. Since then, Daniel Tomson, an attorney, has provided leadership to the group as “vice chair.” None of the three governors in the interim has designated a new chair.

The faculty governance leaders and senior administrative leaders rated the University Council as “effective” and its members as “dedicated to the University.” The University-wide survey of Voting Faculty (defined as both teaching faculty and professional employees), conducted for this self-study, gave the body a mean score 3.05 out of 5.0 on “effectiveness.”

The Council posts its functions and membership on the University's Web pages and holds a minimum of four open meetings annually. While governance leaders and campus administrators generally understand its responsibilities, most faculty do not share this perception. This lack of understanding may derive from the SUNY system’s layered structure of governance. In response to the survey question “I understand the functions and responsibilities of the University Council in advancing UAlbany’s mission and objectives,” 33% of the respondents chose “strongly disagree” or “disagree” and 21% chose “neutral.” Just 33% chose “strongly agree” or “agree,”
and 14% indicated “don’t know/not applicable.” Voting Faculty survey respondents were also asked to assess if the governing boards have “functioned effectively in advancing UAlbany’s mission and objectives for the last ten years.” For the Council, 16% of respondents chose “strongly disagree” or “disagree” and 33% chose “neutral,” while 20% chose “strongly agree” or “agree,” and 33% indicated “don’t know/not applicable.”

There is currently no mechanism to assess the Council on a regular, formal basis. Perhaps feedback from this survey should be provided to Council, and the survey repeated on a regular basis (at least triennially), to provide one form of assessment of the Council (as well as other governance and administrative entities that were the subject of the survey).

**Interaction and Communications between Governing Bodies and Faculty, Administration, and Students**

The Board of Trustees and its several committees meet regularly and post agenda of meetings and hold public hearings that are announced well in advance.

University governance has representatives on the SUNY University Faculty Senate, which interacts regularly with Trustees and SUNY System Administration. The president of the (SUNY-wide) Faculty Senate is now a member of the Board but does not have voting rights. However, communication about the Trustees beyond the University Senate is limited.

University Council agenda and minutes clearly show an active awareness of and response to issues relating to students, and reflect fulfillment of its obligation to review the Community Rights and Responsibilities document every two years. It was noted that because that document is maintained by the Division of Student Success and contains more external rules and regulations mandated for inclusion than used to be the case, the Council’s review has required less time than in the past. The other major function of the University Council is presidential searches; for much of the past decade, this responsibility dominated the concerns of the Council. The searches, being personnel matters, necessarily were conducted in closed session.

While the majority of faculty and students have little awareness of the Council beyond what is contained in informational updates and news accounts relating to presidential searches, faculty and students can communicate with the Council through their representatives’ participation at Council meetings. The one concern raised by chairs of the Senate (who as vice chairs attend Council meetings ex officio) is that they were rarely asked to comment and, not being full-fledged voting members of the body, generally felt they should leave when the Council went into closed session. One Senate Chair noted, however, that he remained at the table at such times and was not asked to leave. There was sentiment expressed by faculty leaders in favor of legislation that would grant voting privileges to the faculty representative to the Council.

In the interviews conducted of senior level administrators, some felt they had access to the Council as needed and were invited to report on their functions. One administrator reported having had no opportunity over the years to address the Council.

Gaps in the public availability of information and communications among these important stakeholders over numerous areas probably could be addressed relatively easily. Since information on Board of Trustees meetings on the group’s Website is limited, agendas, summaries of meetings, and other relevant information should be posted along with the existing postings of the Trustees’ Policies and Bylaws. Putting a summary of this information, with appropriate links, on the University Senate’s Website would provide a better context to those
members of the campus who are not familiar with the Board of Trustees and its relationship to SUNY System Administration and the SUNY campuses. The University Senate’s Web pages should also have links to the Web pages of the University Council, SUNY System Administration, the SUNY Board of Trustees, and the University Faculty (SUNY-wide) Senate. College and school bylaws should be posted on their Websites, as currently practiced by the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering.

Where not already done and where appropriate, meeting times, with location and agenda, of the University Senate should be posted in advance on the Web, in keeping with the requirements of the Faculty Bylaws to distribute an agenda one week prior to a Senate meeting. Full text and rationale of bills, resolutions and proposed amendments to the Senate Charter should be posted with the Senate’s agenda for a forthcoming meeting.

The general point regarding communications and the sharing of information among these important stakeholder groups is that each group should be mindful of the completeness of the information on its Website, given that this likely is the main source of information used by the campus community. Satisfying these recommendations might entail resource commitments, as the subcommittee on Administration and Governance’s view is that information gaps, where they occur, are due mainly to the logistics of making the information available, given competing demands on time and resources.

One important example of uneven information is that understanding of the University Council does not match the Council’s significance. A strong theme across the information reviewed for purposes of creating the self-study was the importance and potential value of the University Council. Although there was ample evidence that those who “need” to know of the existence and functions of the University Council do so, there is a general lack of familiarity in the UAlbany community regarding the Council. Therefore, the Council’s yearly series of open meetings should be better publicized, and other campus Websites, notably the University Senate’s pages, provide more information to explain the role of the Council.

In addition, the University should work with the new chancellor to urge that the Governor appoint a chair of the University Council. Additionally, a procedure should be put in place, such as the establishment of a vice chair, for an official who would ascend to the chair’s position on an interim basis if circumstances warrant; in this way, the chair’s position will not remain unfilled for an extended period in the future, as has occurred in the past.

The most substantial recommendation to emerge regarding the University Council is that the campus consider whether to seek legislation to make the Council more of a local board of trustees, extending its functions, notably in fiduciary matters, and perhaps modifying the procedures through which its members are selected. This would require the support of the chancellor and SUNY Board of Trustees. Because University Council members include alumni, faculty, students, and community representatives, the Council is well positioned to have a deep understanding of both the senior administration and the campus as a whole. A Council with a broader mandate could be a very important vehicle for effective presidential evaluation and advocacy for the University with the broader community, including regular communication with the chancellor and Board of Trustees.
Responsibility for and Effectiveness in Securing Resources for UAlbany

There have been five chancellors (or officers in charge) in the last five years and, as noted above, a change in membership of the Board of Trustees. This instability, in the context of the New York State’s continuing financial crisis, may have hampered the effectiveness of System Administration and the Board in securing resources for the System. Interviews suggest that the appointment of Chancellor Zimpher is viewed as promising for the System and for the University at Albany.

The University Council’s official charge does not include securing resources. However, the University Foundation has stepped into this effort for the University, and Council members are very active and supportive in this effort. As recommended above, the role of the University Council should be redefined by the New York State Legislature to include advocacy and fiduciary responsibilities.

Presidential Appointments and Assessments

The University Council discharged its responsibilities with respect to recommending a president twice during the period since the last accreditation. The first search, 2004-05, resulted in the appointment of President Hall, whose sudden death in August 2006 required a second search, which continued into 2009. This latter search produced five finalists whose names, at some of the candidates’ insistence, were not disclosed to the campus or external communities at the time of the campus interviews. There was widespread feeling among UAlbany faculty that this was a procedural violation of SUNY policies, though a fairly large number of governance and other faculty leaders, student government representatives, and administrative leaders participated in the closed, off-campus interviews. As it turned out, the five names were leaked to the local press and, for reasons not made public, all five withdrew their names from consideration. It is critical that in the future all such searches should follow applicable rules.

Subsequently, the University Council consulted members of the Search Committee and recommended to incoming Chancellor Zimpher that President Philip be selected. On June 4, the chancellor announced in a well-attended gathering of faculty, staff, students, and community leaders her recommendation to the Trustees that then Interim President Philip be made permanent in the post. (Last year’s president of the Student Association, on behalf of that organization, had already made this recommendation to the University Senate in his final report.)

With the exception noted above regarding finalists’ names not being made public, the individuals who served as chairs-elect of the University Senate affirmed in interviews with this self-study subcommittee that the Council’s efforts in these searches to recruit a new leader were conducted according to the policies and procedures governing searches. They also testified that faculty input and participation in these searches were appropriately welcomed and regarded.

Presidential assessments are the responsibility of the chancellor and have been affected by considerable transition both in SUNY and at the University. During the period there has been only one presidential review. The presidents interviewed noted the nature and interval of presidential review varied with the chancellor, and there was some consensus among the presidents that it would be beneficial for all concerned if the reviews occurred yearly or biennially so any problems that might be identified could be addressed as soon as possible. It is therefore recommended that frequent, regular reviews by the chancellor of the UAlbany president—as opposed to formal evaluations separated by several years—be instituted, as they
would benefit UAlbany and the president. Regular feedback on the direction of UAlbany from the chancellor to the president would allow any necessary course corrections to occur more easily.

Assessments of activities on campus occur unevenly in the academic and administrative spheres. It seems that, in addition to turnover in leadership, the pressures of routine activities reduce the attention to ongoing and consistent assessment of the performance of units. While continuity and progress in the realm of academic assessment have been achieved, procedures and criteria for reviewing administrative offices and senior administrators have varied with changes in leadership. Some critical new areas, like information technology, received substantial attention by some senior administrators but less attention than warranted from important units like the University Council. The Going Forward Plan is a good example of systematically reviewing issues, and such planning might be built into routine systems of review and assessment. As noted in the chapter on Institutional Effectiveness, the campus should revisit the Institutional Assessment Plan, with particular emphasis on refocusing administrative unit assessments.

It is strongly recommended that the campus survey of faculty completed for the Middle States self-study be done annually as a way to monitor faculty views and conditions at the University.

**University Administration**

The University Administration is organized under the president, the senior staff, and the oversight and advisory body of the University Council. Appointed by the Board of Trustees, the president serves as the chief executive officer of the University and reports to the chancellor of the State University of New York System (the specific responsibilities of the president are listed on the University’s Website, http://www.albany.edu/presidentialsearch/position.php). Over the past decade the University has been under the leadership of six presidents or interims, and was without a permanent president between the death of President Hall in 2006 and the appointment of Interim President Philip as president in June 2009.

**Clarity of the Requirements and Qualifications for President and Senior Administrative Officers**

Among members of the senior administration interviewed for this study, there is a general consensus that the roles of the University president and senior administrative offices generally were clearly defined and understood during this period of change, although there were some differing views on the appropriate balance of the external and internal roles of the president.

**Effectiveness of Interactions with Governing Bodies and University Governance**

According to the interviews, the frequent transitions of administration produced some ambiguity in the communication of expectations. As a result of senior staff working diligently and persistently to overcome the problem of leadership turnover, team-building between faculty and senior staff has suffered. These transitions have also affected the relationship between the senior administration and governance bodies, including the Senate, student governance, college and school governance and deans, and SUNY System Administration. Frequent disruption of working relationships likely impeded the development of familiarity and trust among individuals and units on campus, including the relationships between administration and faculty governance bodies, resulting in suspicions about lack of “transparency” in decision-making and a lowering of the quality of communications. By no means have these difficulties disabled interactions, but
they seem to have led to their functioning less effectively and efficiently than they would otherwise.

Despite working through contentious issues from time to time, both administrators and those with experience in university governance spoke of an emerging tension involving the administration and governance bodies over the past several years. This tension has often arisen around differences of opinion regarding when consultation with governance bodies is appropriate and a lack of clear consensus on the boundaries of administrative purview. Voting faculty’s overall ratings and open-ended comments regarding the administration and/or the University Senate in the survey also suggest that this is an important concern. It is therefore recommended that the administration and faculty governance examine the tension between the current Board of Trustees’ policies and sections of the faculty bylaws and Senate charter as an important element of their review of strengthening working relationships.

**Clarity of Definition of President’s Role in Relation to SUNY Board of Trustees, University Council, and the University Senate**

Ultimately the president has an active internal and external role in maintaining the academic excellence and fiscal integrity of the University. To achieve these ends, the president works with the SUNY System Administration, the University Council, the University Senate, and with the eight vice presidential divisions of the senior leadership team.

Past presidents and interim presidents interviewed for this study agree that in general the president’s role is clearly defined. This opinion is supported by the survey results which show that the majority (75%) of the voting teaching and non-teaching faculty respondents agree or strongly agree that they “understand the functions and responsibilities of the University Administration” (including the president), while only 10% disagree or strongly disagree (the other 15% are neutral or have no answer). Similarly, past and present senior administrators interviewed for this study agree that the president’s role is clearly defined. Past presidents and interim presidents also agree that the president’s role and responsibilities are clear and distinct from those of the SUNY Board of Trustees, the University Council, and the University Senate. The written policies of these governing bodies are widely available on the Web.³

**Definition and Organizational Description of Senior Administrative Officers and Offices**

The president’s senior leadership team includes eight vice presidential areas: Academic Affairs, Research, Student Success, Finance and Business, the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering (CNSE), Athletics and Recreation, University Development, and Communications and Marketing. The offices of the University Counsel, Diversity and Affirmative Action, Strategic Initiatives, Audit and Management Services, and the CIO also report to the president in the University organizational plan (Appendix 4.5). The vice presidential divisions changed significantly over the course of this self-study period. In the past decade the University has been under the leadership of four different provosts, has added Athletic Administration and Communications and Marketing to the senior administration, and with the addition of CNSE, there is now a senior vice president and chief executive officer of that college who also serves as the vice president and special advisor to the president for University-Wide Economic Innovation & Outreach.

The senior leadership team covers a comprehensive array of administrative responsibilities. The provost supervises eight of the schools and colleges at the University and the offices of Undergraduate Education, International Education, Graduate Studies, Institutional Research, Enrollment Management, and the Libraries. The vice president for Research supports all research endeavors at UAlbany and oversees regulatory research compliance, sponsored programs, technology development, and the University’s research centers, institutes, and laboratories.

The Division of Student Success provides opportunities and support for students to learn the intellectual and personal skills necessary to succeed in an academic community and in a global society. The Department of Athletics and Recreation facilitates the NCAA Division I athletic program and acts as a liaison between the University, athletic administration, and student-athletes, providing academic support services for student-athletes through academic tutoring, counseling, and monitoring.

The Division of Finance and Business oversees the Office of Human Resources and the areas responsible for general accounting, accounts payable and receivable, procurement contracts and purchasing, student financial services, sponsored funds, and other related fiscal functions of the University. The Office of Communications and Marketing is responsible for the integration and implementation of strategic public relations programs designed to build credibility and advance positive visibility of the University among its constituents. The Office of University Development oversees campaign/development, and corporate, foundation and advancement services to raise funds for the University.

CNSE offers the emerging disciplines of nanoscale science and engineering as well as emerging nanoscale-enabled disciplines of the 21st century, including nanoelectronics, nanoeconomics, bioinformatics, renewable green energy, infotonics, environmental technologies, biotechnology, and telecommunications. The leader of CNSE has a unique set of responsibilities, which are reflected in his titles, listed above, as the college’s chief administrator and special advisor to the president on economic innovation and outreach, and also as professor of nanoscience. The CNSE physical plant falls under the purview of that college.

One of the most significant developments in administration and governance since 2000 has been the growth and development of CNSE and the evolution of a system whereby it remains within the University while being granted separate, autonomous governance structures in key areas (SUNY Board of Trustees resolutions 2004-41 and 2008-165 and University Senate Resolution 0405-01R, at Website http://www.albany.edu/senate/0405-01R_Resolution_Endorsing_MOU_with_CSNE.htm).

Methodology and Effectiveness of President and Senior Administrative Officer Assessment

Senior administrative areas reported that internal performance reviews by the Office of the President are completed, but that the methodology used has been inconsistent from year to year given the frequent turnover of senior leadership. Each unit also has its own style of conducting its reviews. The presidents and provosts have had performance reviews but they have not been consistent, either in regularity or methodology. Performance reviews have ranged in frequency and scope from annual evaluations to 360-degree evaluations. Those interviewed acknowledge that some offices and departments cannot be evaluated using the same methods and standards as others. The performance of The Office of University Development, for example, can clearly be evaluated by seeing how fundraising levels compare with fundraising goals; a review of the more
dynamic mission and goals of the Office of Academic Affairs, on the other hand, requires a much different method of evaluation. Collective bargaining agreements and SUNY Board of Trustees policies dictate annual review of all professional staff, but this has not been done consistently across the University under different administrations.

**Appropriate Staffing in Relation to Overall Institutional Mission and Goals and the Pursuit of Professional Development**

Within each unit, there are procedures to develop a mission and to set goals and monitor their attainment. However, as discussed in Chapter 2, planning has been episodic in some units and uncoordinated with planning conducted by other units within the institution. Again, the methodology for planning differs from unit to unit. An overwhelming majority of the divisions reported that they are understaffed. A significant majority reported that the lack of staff is affecting the division’s ability to fulfill its mission. All divisions have been forced to do more with less. The only divisions that claim staffing is adequate are those that raise their own funding from external sources.

Staffing issues also extend to professional development. All units report that, due to a lack of funding, there is a problem with offering professional development. Budgets have been cut sharply and travel is one of the first items to go. There are some opportunities for on-campus training, but this does not fill all needs. The attending of external conferences offers the best opportunities for casual networking with colleagues and learning how others are handling similar problems. Creating external contacts is also extremely important. Rectifying these deficiencies may have to wait for substantial improvement in the budget situation.

**Adequacy of Information Technology Infrastructure for the Academic Mission and Individual Office Support of the Academic Mission**

Units that support the attainment of the University’s academic mission include ITS and the University Libraries. The range of satisfaction with IT services is diverse. The academic support structure reports more satisfaction than the administrative divisions. There is an inherent challenge in reconciling what the administrative units feel it takes to do the job and what ITS is able to accomplish with current resources. The opinion supported by the survey is that the University Libraries’ infrastructure supports the academic and research missions of the University effectively; 60% of the respondents felt the Libraries performed “somewhat well” or “very well.” In contrast, only 37% of faculty and staff surveyed thought existing information and decision-support systems adequately inform administrative decisions “somewhat well” or “very well.” From the student perspective, it is noteworthy that computing support has been an area of steady student satisfaction, as exhibited in the 2000, 2003, 2006, and 2009 findings of SUNY’s Student Opinion Survey (SOS). In the most recent SOS (2009), 62% of students reported being satisfied or very satisfied with computer support services, and 69% were satisfied or very satisfied with the University’s computer network.

**Clarity of Lines of Organizational Authority and Responsibility in Administrative Offices**

Most administrative areas have an extremely tight organizational structure and definitive lines of reporting and accountability are clear. As reported by one division where two areas of responsibility overlapped, the staffs from each area felt they were ultimately accountable but did not have the authority to effectively carry out that responsibility.
Influence and Operations of Union Agreements and Research Foundation Agreements

Union agreements are understood at the University and clearly recognized by administration. There is some concern that union agreements provide unwelcome limitations with respect to personnel issues. For example, administrators across the divisions agree that unions lessen the ability to meet recent budget cuts. However, most acknowledge that unions are an intrinsic part of the University administrative environment and that their policies must be incorporated in decisions.

Union leadership believes that there has been an overarching improvement in working relationships with campus administration over the past five years. Accessibility, inclusiveness, and open door policies set forth by presidents over this period have facilitated positive working relationships between union leadership and administrators at multiple levels which are highly respected as being proactive. Union leadership believes that this has led to consultative practices between labor and management that result in fewer contract violations as well as diminished multi-level grievance proceedings.

The Research Foundation (RF) is another organization that deals with personnel at the University. The RF was created in 1951 to support research, education and public service at SUNY. Through a 1977 agreement with SUNY, the RF was designated as the organization responsible for managing sponsored programs. The RF helps SUNY acquire, administer and manage external funds to advance research and education, and transfer technology from campuses to the marketplace. The RF provides SUNY campuses with services, such as affiliated corporation establishment and support, sponsored programs administration, and technology transfer. Related services that the RF performs include human resources/payroll administration and purchasing and payables administration for campus-related organization and affiliated corporations.

The RF is a private, nonprofit educational corporation. It does not receive services provided to New York State agencies or state appropriations to support corporate functions. The RF is an employer separate and distinct from SUNY and the State of New York, thereby offering separate and distinct compensation and benefits. The RF is governed by a board of directors, composed of representatives of business and industry, researchers and campus and system administrators. The chancellor of the University serves as chair of the board ex officio. A Sponsored Programs Advisory Council, composed of faculty researchers and campus administrators, provides operating advice to RF management.

The RF consists of a central office working in conjunction with operating units at 30 campus locations across New York State. The campus RF offices are responsible for the day-to-day administration of sponsored programs, including financial, human resources, procurement and reporting activities. The offices provide this support in accordance with federal, sponsor, RF, SUNY, and campus guidelines. Sponsored program functions delegated to the campuses are conducted under the supervision of RF operations managers, who are appointed by the RF’s board on the recommendation of the respective campus presidents. The RF maintains an internal audit office that has a direct reporting line to the board of directors in addition to external auditors.
Faculty Governance

The Policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees state that, on SUNY campuses, the faculty “shall have the obligation to participate significantly in the initiation, development and implementation of the educational program.” The faculty “shall prepare and adopt bylaws which shall contain: (1) Provisions for committees and their responsibilities; (2) Procedures for the calling and conduct of faculty meetings and elections; and (3) Provisions for such other matters of organization and procedure as may be necessary for the performance of their responsibilities ….Bylaws shall be consistent with and subject to the Policies of the Board of Trustees of State University of New York, the laws of the State of New York, and the provisions of agreements between the State of New York, and the certified employee organization established pursuant to Article 14 of the Civil Service Law. Provisions of bylaws concerning consultation with the faculty shall be subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer of the college. All actions under bylaws shall be advisory upon the chancellor and the chief administrative officer of the college.”

The two main documents at the University at Albany relating to faculty governance are the Faculty Bylaws and the Charter of the University Senate. The preamble to the Faculty Bylaws states: “The responsibility of the Faculty for the conduct of the University's instructional, research, and service programs, and its right to create bylaws to establish mechanisms to discharge those responsibilities, are derived from the ‘State University of New York Policies of the Board of Trustees.’” The Bylaws establish “the inclusion of professional as well as teaching staff into the faculty, and the inclusion of participation from administration and students into a University Senate.” Thus, the University Senate is not a “faculty senate;” it is a University Senate. Some faculty are “teaching-only” faculty, while many professional staff members are members of the Senate and referred to as “Non-teaching Faculty,” although some do in fact teach classes. The Senate also includes ex officio members of the administration and student representatives.

Beginning in 2001 the University Senate Executive Committee began comprehensively revising the Faculty Bylaws and the Charter of the University Senate. The revisions originally were initiated because current practices in areas such as Senate communication with the faculty did not align with the decades-old text of the Bylaws and Charter which, for example, predated internet communication. Regardless of the original impetus for the revisions, the changes were made in a context in which some faculty members and some members of the University administration disagreed sharply on specific issues. A faculty committee drafted the revisions in consultation with faculty and the administration; they were approved unanimously on December 8, 2003, and signed by President Hitchcock. Partly reflecting this context, the revised Bylaws and Charter set out in much greater detail the mechanisms through which the administration consults with the faculty, and explicitly identified the University Senate as the body representing the collective will of the faculty.

The revision of the University’s Faculty Bylaws and adoption of the Senate Charter also increased the number of teaching and professional faculty members of the Senate and most of its councils and committees. In addition, a new standing committee, two new councils, and several new council subcommittees were created. Because the revised Bylaws established attendance requirements, attendance is monitored, but so far no senator has had to face expulsion for absenteeism.
The University Senate membership contains ex-officio voting members, appointed members, and elected members spanning the range of constituencies on campus (See Article II, Section 2 of the Bylaws). The Executive Committee of the Senate (Article II, Section 4) contains the elected leadership of the Senate, including Council chairs and elected leaders of certain student governance organizations.

In addition to the Executive Committee of the Senate, the Senate contains other committees and councils, all of which are discussed in detail in the Bylaws and Charter. These councils and committees, which are listed on the current University Senate Web page http://www.albany.edu/senate/councils_committees.htm, span the range of programs and issues found at the University at Albany, providing a structure in which the University Senate can engage the University comprehensively. University Senate elections have been conducted in a timely fashion, and more than enough faculty members have volunteered to fill Senate committees and councils. To support the goal of broad participation in university governance, term limits were instituted. Under Bylaws Section II.2.8, the term limit for someone elected to the Senate is six consecutive years (three consecutive two-year terms). The elected senators are 10 teaching faculty, professional faculty and part-time faculty elected University-wide by the voting faculty, plus 44 voting faculty elected proportionately by their colleges and schools plus the 12 undergraduate and graduate students elected by their constituencies. The term limit for faculty membership on a Senate council or standing committee is also six consecutive years. There is no term limit for an ex officio member of a council, standing committee, subcommittee of a council, or the Senate Executive Committee. In recent years the Senate has improved its administrative and information systems in an attempt to stimulate faculty engagement in governance, such as a system of on-line voting in Senate elections. The documents establishing faculty governance are readily available to the campus community through the Senate Website, and address governance issues comprehensively. Furthermore, the Website contains extensive information on the Senate’s operations, including membership, schedules, reports, meeting minutes, texts of legislation and resolution, and other materials. Survey respondents generally understand the functions of the Senate. The survey of faculty completed for this self-study presented the statement “I understand the functions and responsibilities of the UAlbany University Senate in advancing UAlbany's mission and objectives.” Using a 1-5 scale, with 5 indicating “Strongly Agree,” the average of responses was 3.50 overall, and 3.57 and 3.41 for teaching-only (TO) and non-teaching (NT) faculty, respectively.

One other level of faculty governance is at the college and school level. The Faculty Bylaws state that colleges and schools should establish bylaws, although such bylaws are not required. Eight of the University at Albany's nine schools and colleges, as well as the University Libraries, have written bylaws in place. The College of Computing and Information does not yet have written bylaws. While bylaws vary somewhat among the schools and colleges, the documents typically outline the role of the faculty, the role and responsibilities of any standing committees, governance structures, as well as policies pertaining to these structures, and the duties and responsibilities of the administration of the college or school. Most of the schools and colleges have faculty governance structures that address personnel policies, school/college budget issues, and organizational issues. These governance structures at the school and college level also generate many of the proposals that go to the University Senate.

---
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The College of Arts and Sciences and CNSE have posted their bylaws and information regarding faculty governance in an easily accessible manner on their colleges’ Websites. The bylaws of the other seven schools and colleges are not posted on Websites and thus not as widely available.

The Extent to Which Faculty Governance Reflects its Written Procedures

The University Senate has dealt with a substantial number of proposals and campus issues over the period of the self-study. From the 2002-2003 through the 2008-2009 academic years (for which data are readily available), the Senate forwarded to the president 160 completed items of legislation, ranging from 13 items in 2002-2003 to 34 in 2007-2008.

Faculty responses to the survey regarding the Senate’s core work of program review and approval are generally neutral. The responses to the statement “The processes of the University Senate are constructive and effective for curricular changes, new programs, or other initiatives requiring Senate review” were 3.15 for all faculty, 3.05 for teaching-only (TO) faculty, and 3.26 for non-teaching (NT) faculty. Twenty-three percent of faculty members (19% TO faculty and 28% NT faculty) indicated “don’t know/not applicable” in response to this statement.

In the period covered by the self-study the University Senate has engaged several complex issues affecting a wide range of organizations and processes on campus. These include, among many other matters, the revisions of the Faculty Bylaws and the Senate Charter, the creation of the CNSE the College of Computing and Information, related governance matters, and the establishment of a new procedure for review of alleged academic misconduct. The evidence suggests that the campus governance system has demonstrated an ability to deal with potentially contentious issues in ways that, while not necessarily leading to unanimous agreement, avoided long-term, persistent conflicts.

Effectiveness of Faculty Governance Interaction with Governing Bodies and Administration

Faculty governance participates actively in University decision-making, as indicated by its formal responsibilities and authority outlined in the Faculty Bylaws and Senate Charter and the numerous actions spanning campus life undertaken since 2000. Interviews with University administrators done for the self-study indicate vividly that faculty governance is a salient presence in the way these administrators conduct their operations and make decisions.

There is a long-standing tension between the wording of the Policies of the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Bylaws that may put a strain on effective working relationships on campus. The policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees emphasize the importance of faculty involvement in decisions on campuses; faculty must become involved in an effective, responsible way, and administrators must consult extensively with faculty. At the same time, at the campus level, the president retains the ultimate authority for decisions subject to federal and state law, collective bargaining agreements, or other higher authorities, and the Board of Trustees policies state: “All actions under bylaws shall be advisory upon the chancellor and the chief administrative officer of the college.”

However, Article II, Section 2.4 of the Faculty Bylaws says that “the Faculty executes its responsibilities directly, as authorized by Section 2.2.1” (curriculum, academic standards, and other areas). The Board of Trustees policies stipulate that “All actions under bylaws shall be advisory upon the chancellor and the chief administrative officer of the college,” and Section 2.2.1. of the Faculty Bylaws says “The Faculty may initiate and shall disapprove or approve and
recommend for implementation...” [changes in curriculum and so forth; italics added]. So, it is not clear what it means to say that the Senate “directly” exercises control over any area.

Also, the statement in Article II, Section 1 of the Faculty Bylaws that “The Senate shall be the principal policy-forming body of the University” does not square with the Board of Trustees Policies’ emphasis on the authority and accountability of the chief administrative officer to the Board of Trustees regarding decisions on campus. In practice, a president who pushed his or her authority so far as to disregard major and often decisive faculty input on curricular decisions and the like would be ineffective because such action would antagonize the faculty. On the other hand, if the University Senate saw itself as “the principal policy-forming body of the University” to the degree that it asserted control over decisions which the Board of Trustees’ policies place with the president’s administration — for which the president is accountable — it would make it difficult for the administrative system to operate effectively.

The Middle States Site Visit team in 2000 led off its discussion of university governance by saying: “The University at Albany may be one of those unusual, increasingly rare campuses where governance appears to work effectively and relatively efficiently—as perceived by both administrators and the faculty—at the University, School, and College levels. In an era in which effective campus governance is all too rare, there is a consensus at the institution that the values of shared governance are alive and well.” As noted above, the revised Faculty Bylaws and Senate Charter, approved in 2003-2004, elaborated and formalized procedures of administrative consultation with the Senate. As these changes have been interpreted and implemented, different perspectives within Senate leadership and the University administration on the appropriate balance of administration and faculty authority in dealing with campus issues have increased the level of tension between the administration and Senate since 2004. These tensions have not disabled shared governance, but the theme of increased tension did surface in interviews, and in open-ended responses to the survey, and the working relationships have not been as successful as they otherwise might have been.

Interviews with individuals functioning in the presidential or provost roles in recent years referred to the relationship with the University Senate as, on the high end, one of mutual respect. On the low end, the interviews referred to, among other traits, “constant negativity and general suspicion” to a degree not seen at any other institution with which the individual had experience. In between were comments by administrators referring to an adversarial atmosphere with the University Senate. Referring to senior administrators belonging to the Senate as ex officio members, one individual spoke of a perceived sentiment within the Senate Executive Committee that ex officio members are not “real” members. This individual also referred to the “oppositional quality” of interactions with the University Senate. Subcommittee notes from the group interview with Senate chairs, and a written response to questions, produced comments (Appendix 4.2) from multiple participants on the interactions of the University Senate with the administration. Results show diverse perspectives on the effectiveness of those interactions. For example, Senate leadership continues to express concerns about what it believes to be a lack of consultation by the administration with faculty governance over the past several years. These concerns are outlined in a report by the Governance Council to the Senate in 2009 (http://www.albany.edu/senate/03-09-09_Senate_Minutes.doc, and http://www.albany.edu/senate/04-06-09_Senate_Minutes-jwd.doc).
One of the concerns discussed in the subcommittee, and expressed in open-ended responses to the faculty survey, is that over the past five years there has been a group of members appearing repeatedly on the Senate Executive Committee, reinforcing an ongoing tension with the administration. The subcommittee examined a spreadsheet of the frequency with which individuals participated on the Senate Executive Committee since 2000 (Appendix 4.3). The subcommittee did not unanimously agree on the implications of repeated appearance of individuals on the Senate Executive Committee in the recent period.

One point of view on this issue is that the composition of Senate leadership, and the membership of its councils and committees and the Senate as a whole, reflect an open, transparent, and legally established process of elections and appointments. No group of faculty members could exercise disproportionate influence over the University Senate, given the openness and transparency of this process; outcomes reflect the collective will of the faculty. Furthermore, since 2004 the increase in the volume of formal legislation generated by the Senate demonstrates an increase in the vitality and effectiveness of faculty governance on campus, and a restoration of an appropriate and constructive level of faculty influence that had weakened in the preceding two decades (Appendix 4.4.). Over this period the University Senate has affirmed the essential role of the faculty, emphasized in the Board of Trustees’ policies, in overseeing decisions at the University.

The other point of view is that in recent years the political environment and implementation of this legally established process have become dysfunctional. A small group of voting faculty that is intensely interested in governance and suspicious of the administration has shaped the operating style of the Senate since 2004, and other faculty members are less likely to participate in the Senate or have withdrawn from it. The recent proliferation of Senate legislation reflects an overreaching of attempts to control activities at the University, eroding what were well-functioning working relationships between faculty governance and the administration. The spike in formal legislation exemplifies a problem rather than a healthy situation. As noted above, individuals differ in the extent to which they hold either of these points of view.

**Effectiveness with which the Senate Represents Constituencies and Informs Administrative Operations**

As noted earlier, the Faculty Bylaws establish “the inclusion of professional as well as teaching staff into the faculty, and the inclusion of participation from administration and students into a University Senate.” Thus, the University Senate is not a faculty senate; it is a University Senate, combining faculty, administrators, and students.

The UAlbany Faculty/Staff Re-Accreditation Survey (December 2008) surveyed faculty, including teaching-only faculty (TO) and non-teaching faculty (NT) (non-teaching faculty generally are in administrative roles). About 77% of the faculty respondents answered “none” or “not much” when asked of their level of participation in the University Senate; the corresponding figures for TO and NT Faculty were 72% and 83%, respectively. An ambiguity in these results is whether respondents were referring to their current direct participation in the Senate as Senate members or members of a Senate council or committee—which by definition would produce a low rate of participation—or responding on their overall level of participation or engagement.
with the Senate over the last several years. However, other information, discussed below, indicates a low level of interest and participation in the University Senate on the part of faculty.

On average, faculty members respond neutrally to the statement “The University Senate has functioned effectively in advancing the University's mission and objectives for the last ten years.” The overall faculty rating of the Senate was 3.11, with 2.97 for teaching-only faculty and 3.29 for non-teaching faculty. The group interview with faculty members who had served as Senate chairs indicated hope for wider faculty participation in the Senate. The comments referred to faculty tendencies to focus on their disciplines as opposed to more collective University issues raised by the Senate, resulting in limited faculty participation in the Senate.

The Faculty Bylaws and Charter of the University Senate call for substantial student participation in the Senate as a whole and on its councils and committees. For example, Article II, Section 2.6 of the Bylaws specifies that the Senate should include 15 student senators, with undergraduate and graduate students represented in proportion to their enrollment at the University; the majority of the councils and committees also require appointment of student members. Students, including students appointed to the Senate and its councils and committees, actually are involved in Senate activities much less than the Bylaws and Charter specify. Student attendance at meetings is, at best, uneven, with a small number of students participating on a consistent basis but most student members not participating. Students and faculty comment that student appointees likely underestimate the time commitments of the Senate and the University Senate interacts with student organizations infrequently, leading to students not seeing it as central to student governance.

Student leaders also comment, however, that when students are interested in specific issues before the Senate they are able to become involved through the power granted to them by the Bylaws and Charter, and have done so on several occasions over the period covered by the self-study. So, while student participation in the University Senate is low, this is more a function of student choice than an absence of formal access and power. However, student leaders also noted that periodic visits by University Senate leaders to meetings of student governance organizations — in a show of reciprocity — might lead students to increase their Senate involvement.

While faculty governance and administration interactions have been largely effective and successful, it is nonetheless important to encourage wider involvement in governance by faculty members and students. It is recommended that the president, provost, vice presidents, college and school deans, department chairs, and directors of offices and centers encourage their faculty, both teaching and professional, to run for seats on the University Senate and their college/school governance bodies, and to volunteer for Senate councils. Student Association and Graduate Student Organization should attempt to elect their Senators and place student representatives on Senate councils early enough for the students to participate fully in the governance process. The University Senate should consider amending the process by which part-time faculty Senators are elected (currently by vote of full-time faculty) and examine whether comparable representation on the Senate should be extended to representatives of the emeritus faculty and of those employed in the Research Foundation.

**Ongoing Assessment of Faculty Governance**

While a formal structure of periodic review of faculty governance is not in place, faculty governance at the University at Albany is quite active, and it has responded to a variety of new issues. Since 2000, this is indicated, for example, by the number of its formal actions sent to the
president, revision of the Faculty Bylaws and Charter, review of the establishment of CNSE and the College of Computing and Information, and the establishment of new procedures for investigating alleged academic misconduct. The subcommittee noted the value of the survey of faculty in assessing faculty perceptions of governance, as in other areas. Repeating the survey on an ongoing basis—triennially or biennially—would be a valuable exercise.
APPENDICES

Appendix 4.1 Summary of Recommendations

- The administration and faculty governance should examine the tension between the current Board of Trustees policies and sections of the faculty bylaws and Senate charter as an important element of their review of strengthening working relationships.

- In order to encourage wider involvement in governance by faculty members and students:
  - The president, provost, vice presidents, college and school deans, department chairs, and directors of offices and centers should encourage their faculty, both teaching and professional, to run for seats on the University Senate and their college/school governance bodies, and also to volunteers for Senate councils.
  - The Student Association and Graduate Student Organization should attempt to elect their Senators and place student representatives on Senate councils early enough for the students to participate fully in the governance process.
  - The University Senate should consider amending the process by which part-time faculty Senators are elected (currently by vote of full-time faculty).
  - The University Senate should consider extending comparable representation on the Senate to representatives of the Emeritus Faculty and those employed in the Research Foundation.

- In order to close the gaps in the public availability of information and communications among faculty governance, the Board of Trustees, and the University Council:
  - Agendas, summaries of meetings, meeting Webcast announcements and links, and other relevant information should be posted along with the existing postings of the Trustees’ Policies and Bylaws.
  - The University Senate's Web pages should add links to the Web pages of the University Council, SUNY System Administration, the SUNY Board of Trustees, and the University Faculty (SUNY-wide) Senate.
  - The University Council’s Website should include information about its role and a schedule of its open meetings.
  - Feedback from the University-wide survey of voting faculty should be provided to the Council, (and the survey repeated on a regular basis — at least triennially — to provide one form of assessment of the Council as well as other governance and administrative entities).
  - College and school bylaws should be posted on their Websites, as currently practiced by the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering.
  - Where not already done and where appropriate, meeting times, place and agenda of the University Senate should be posted in advance on the Web, in keeping with the requirements of the Faculty Bylaws to distribute an agenda one week prior to a Senate meeting. Full text and rationale of bills, resolutions and proposed
amendments to the Senate Charter should be posted with the Senate's agenda for a forthcoming meeting

- The University should work with the new chancellor to urge the Governor to appoint a chair of the University Council, and that a procedure be put in place, such as the establishment of a vice-chair who would ascend to the chair’s position on an interim basis if circumstances warrant, so that the chair’s position will not remain unfilled for an extended period in the future, as has occurred in the past.

- The campus should seek legislation to make the Council more of a local board of trustees, extending its functions, notably in fiduciary matters, and perhaps modifying the procedures through which its members are selected.

- Frequent regularized UAlbany presidential reviews should be conducted by the chancellor, as opposed to the current formal evaluations separated by several years.

- As noted in the chapter on Institutional Effectiveness, the campus should revisit the Institutional Assessment Plan, with particular emphasis on refocusing administrative unit assessments, as administrative unit assessments are largely uneven in coverage and application.

- The campus survey of faculty, completed for the Middle States self-study, should definitely be done annually as a way to monitor faculty views and conditions at the University.
Appendix 4.2 Summary of Comments from the Group Interview with Senate Chairs

- Currently it is pretty effective.
- I don’t know how you measure or assess.
- The recent history is pretty good, but not perfect.
- It’s difficult to answer the question. The nature of the relationship depends heavily on personality.
- Ideally, you want governance to have consultative role with administration. Often, in the past, there was notification, but there have been other cases where there has been genuine advice.
- In earlier days there was a number of *ex officio* members on committees, and concern about administrative presence on those committees. There was a concern that many curricular issues were being done in administrative rather than Senate committees.
- There is a piece in the current bylaws/charter regarding assessment of administration that we are not doing.
- One needs to distinguish between notification and consultation.
- We are an important resource.
- *Ex officio* members on Senate committees remain an issue; the members are valuable, but there is question of balance.
- Budget transparency remains an issue.
- Sense of mutual trust and respect is critical. We need to distinguish between vigilance and cynicism; cynicism is not what you should be walking into a meeting with.
- We need judicious, thoughtful strategies, rather than automatically going nuclear.
- Beware of your reputation; it is your most valuable asset.
- Given the lack of stability of administration, we don’t have a good chance to develop stable relationships and trust over time.

The final bulleted point comes from a written response submitted by a former Senate chair who did not participate in the group interview.

- For the last couple of years, and even more during the current year, faculty governance as represented by University Senate and in particular its Senate Executive Committee has NOT interacted effectively with administration...How is the lack of effectiveness of the Senate measured? — by the decreasing attendance at Senate meetings, by the increasing unwillingness of faculty members to serve on Senate committees and councils, and by the lack of term limits for members of the Senate Executive Committee, who appear to have used their positions to create niches of power for themselves.
## Appendix 4.3: Membership on University Senate Executive Committee (SEC) 2000-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total SEC Members</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Collier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. MacDonald</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Savitt</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Range</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Lanford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Wulfert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Dudek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Dewar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Pipkin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Hoyt</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Lyons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. McCaffrey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Lifshin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Moore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Delano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Kranich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Snyder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Pryse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Sherman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Messner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Turner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Shub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Spitze</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Monfasani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Raffalovich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Schell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Dalton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Chaiken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Doellefeld</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Idone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Haas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Carr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Rodriguez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Wagner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Andrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Baran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Castracane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Charlambous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Horton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Reinhold-Larrson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Mullin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Videka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.-A. McNutt</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Abolafia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Raider</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Rodriguez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Duchessi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Bosco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Toseland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Zitomer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Fessler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Friedman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Goel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Sherman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. Liang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4.5 Current Organization of UAlbany
Chapter 5: Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment of Student Learning

Overview

This chapter details how the University at Albany assesses itself and one of its most fundamental outcomes, student learning. What follows is a discussion and review of institutional assessment processes and assessment of student learning processes and outcomes at UAlbany. Concerning the latter, the chapter addresses the degree to which UAlbany has policies and procedures in place to ensure at graduation, or other appropriate points in time, that its students have the knowledge, skills, and competencies the University professes to instill in them.

Much of the data and information considered are available to University employees and prospective students. Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness (IRPE) is a major source of official data about the University. IRPE has a shared responsibility for the development of campus administrative databases, as well as for database information management and analysis. Data and information about the University are available on IRPE’s Website. For example, the Website maintains electronic files that provide current members of the University, as well as prospective students and other interested parties, with substantial information about University-wide assessments. The information includes enrollment, student profiles, degrees awarded, graduate admission trends, retention, and course planning materials, as well as organizational charts and a common data set. The Website also provides information about the enrollment and graduation rates of students in all programs through its department profiles, which may be very informative for prospective students and their parents. Information about the spring 2008 graduate survey is available on the Web page http://www.albany.edu/ir/uasurvey/gradsurvey.pdf. Moreover, the Middle States Wiki contains valuable information for the broad constituency of part-time faculty, full-time faculty, and administrative staff. In fall 2008, after the General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC), the Council on Academic Assessment (CAA), and the provost discussed information sharing, the University decided to post General Education assessment reports on a Web page for viewing by both internal and external audiences.

The CAA agreed, however, that, in order to foster honest self-reflection, the University had to maintain certain restrictions on the viewing of potentially sensitive internal documents. In 2007, the CAA approved a protocol allowing interested members of the University community to read the self-study reports in hard copy form, upon request. Additionally, the CAA required parties external to the University to formally petition IRPE to gain access to internal assessment documents. While the sharing of information in the spirit of transparency is widely supported by
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1 http://www.albany.edu/ir/whatdata.htm
2 http://www.albany.edu/assessment/gen_ed_assess.html
faculty and the administration, the University to date has not developed a formal process for proactively sharing information about assessment with various stakeholders. While there is at times an acknowledged inherent conflict between governance, administrative processes, and their need for confidentiality, with the need for transparency and broader information-sharing, UAlbany should consider developing formal policies and procedures for proactively sharing information about departmental assessment activities with various members of the University community, rather than the current “reactive” policy.

Part I of this chapter focuses on institutional assessment while Part II focuses on assessment of student learning. Although we identify opportunities for improvement throughout the report, we summarize those opportunities as a list of recommendations at the end of each major part.

Part I. Institutional Assessment

The Evolution of UAlbany’s Assessment Process

Since the University’s Middle States re-accreditation in 2000, and Middle States’ subsequent revision of its accreditation standards in 2002 to emphasize the use of evidence-based assessment processes throughout the institution, a number of operational units across the campus have begun to systematically assess their operations and services provided to students.

An Institutional Assessment Plan (IAP) was developed in 2004 by the provost’s Assessment Advisory Committee (PAAC). The IAP contains protocols and guidelines for assessing majors. Additionally, the IAP contains the State University of New York (SUNY) General Education Assessment Plan.

The IAP acknowledges UAlbany’s long history of using assessment to inform campus decision-making on a number of levels with regard to programmatic and operational matters affecting students, social, intellectual, and personal development. It is important to note that many of the ongoing activities described in the IAP did not arise in response to a call for an Assessment Plan, but rather gave rise to it. Assessment and linkages to planning and decision-making across the University precede the more recent national call to arms for accountability in teaching, learning, and institutional effectiveness. As a result, the IAP is better viewed as a formal statement of operating procedures at the University. The IAP attempts to enhance past assessment activities by laying out a comprehensive approach across the institution with regard to offices and programs, assessment plan standards, implementation consistency, and documentation of assessment activity. The IAP is a shared statement of the University community, and a commitment to share assessment results with students and other concerned parties.

The University establishes assessment activities on the basis of its mission and strategic goals. Underlying this approach is the belief that “good assessment is good research” and that, as a research university, UAlbany possesses the faculty and staff expertise, and the conviction, to use this expertise to evaluate itself, seek improvements, and demonstrate its efficiency and effectiveness in a manner transparent to its various stakeholders.
The IAP document originally guided each vice president to develop an assessment plan describing how their division supports and measures the achievement of divisional and institutional goals. Divisional, academic unit, and administrative assessment plans and annual activity reports would be shared with or made available to various campus constituencies to promote collegial review and community awareness of assessment processes and efforts. IAP's provisions for academic and administrative unit assessment plans were complemented by the 2005 Compact Planning process, which focused on selective investment proposals. Academic unit assessment plans now exist in virtually every department and program, owing to requirements for developing them as part of the University’s cyclic program-review process. However, the development and implementation of administrative unit assessment plans have lagged considerably, with the exception of units in the Division of Student Success, where assessment plans and annual reports have been compiled for the better part of the last decade.

In response to a SUNY mandate, the University developed its 2006 Strengthened Campus-Based Assessment (SCBA) plan, which calls for use of SUNY-wide rubrics for assessing student writing and critical thinking, use of nationally-normed tests in mathematics (later changed to locally developed, but SUNY-approved rubrics), and a planned spring 2008 administering of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The UAlbany IAP plan builds upon the University’s longstanding history of assessment and sets forth a formal framework for developing, conducting, utilizing, and communicating assessment activities, in both teaching and learning and in the assessment of institutional effectiveness.

Although the various activities and missions of a research university are interrelated, for organizational purposes the University’s proposed assessment plan lays out procedures and expectations for assessment in the following two areas: Student learning, which encompasses major assessment and General Education assessment; and institutional effectiveness – in research, public service, academic support, and administrative services.

While most administrative units are involved to some degree in activities that gauge success and inform the planning and budgeting processes, the University does not require those units to develop formal assessment plans across vice presidential divisions. (Administrative units developed compact plans and strategic initiative proposals from late 2005 through 2007.) At present, the University focuses more on day-to-day operational matters. Certainly, offering non-academic (administrative) units some blueprint or road map for assessment in their areas — requiring the submission and ongoing refinement of assessment plans and encouraging the coordination of the assessment process through designated personnel at the division and/or unit level — would be an important first step in bringing administrative assessment in line with academic assessment.

On the academic side, the IAP, as noted above, incorporates existing frameworks for assessment of majors, as prescribed in the program review process by the CAA, and for assessment of the General Education program, as specified in the General Education Assessment Plan (GEAP), which the General Education Committee of the Undergraduate Academic Council developed and which the SUNY General Education and Assessment Review (GEAR) group approved. These two formal processes are contained in their entirety within the campus-wide plan; the University
has faithfully executed them via the submission of annual school/college assessment reports in 2006 and 2007. Academic units perform assessments; however, they do so with varying degrees of rigor, as demonstrated in a review of assessment plans (see below, Part I, Academic Program Assessments section).

The CAA, constituted in 2004 under a revision to the faculty bylaws, oversees both assessments of academic programs (undergraduate and graduate) and the campus’s cyclical review of its General Education program. Additionally, the president and provost, through IRPE, sponsor assessment workshops and seminars on-campus. Worth noting is that in 2006 the University Senate reassigned the General Education Assessment Subcommittee (GEAS) from the Undergraduate Academic Council’s (UAC) General Education Committee, which has primary oversight of the University’s General Education program, to a committee (the General Education Assessment Committee) of the CAA. It was felt that the assessment of the General Education program should not reside with the committee charged with program oversight, but instead with the CAA.

The University developed several staff and administrative positions, as well as committees that support assessment activities:

- **Director of Program Review and Assessment** – The University created this position in 2001 to maintain and advance momentum regarding academic assessment of majors and General Education program. The position has been filled since July 2007 on an interim basis.

- **Assistant vice president for strategic planning and assessment** – In 2003, the University created this position and, in 2006, redefined it to assistant vice president for Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness. The job focus changed from overall campus-wide responsibility for developing assessment protocols and policy to focusing on academic assessment and oversight for the campus’s Institutional Research (IR) office. The University also renamed the IR office to the Office of IRPE. Currently, this position reports directly to the provost.

- **The appointment of both a vice provost for institutional assessment as well as a vice provost for planning and administration occurred with the appointments of a new president and provost in 2005. Both positions were vacated with the transition in senior campus leadership and neither has been filled since.**

- **The provost’s assessment advisory committee** – The PAAC advised the provost and vice president for Academic Affairs and was charged with ensuring that the University’s policies, procedures, and guidelines regarding assessment-related activities met internal needs and external mandates. The PAAC was eliminated after it helped establish the campus Institutional Assessment Plan (IAP). Today, the Council on Academic Assessment accomplishes this work through its Program Review Committee (PRC), done in cooperation with IRPE staff.

The campus financially supports the academic program review process. Each year, approximately four to eight departments have their self-studies reviewed by external reviewers,
who also visit campus to collect additional information and explore the content areas further. These visits and associated costs are covered by the campus financial plan, and are not borne by the units. Total costs typically run in the $30-$45K range annually and include the total costs for external reviewers and visits. This figure does not include UAlbany staff time or other expenditures (e.g. surveys) in support of assessments or program reviews.

Financial support for professional development and training of the director of Program Review and Assessment and/or other faculty/staff is not part of the planning and budgeting process. Occasional assessment-related conferences or meetings for those in assessment planning roles (e.g., associate dean for General Education or director of Program Review and Assessment) have been borne out of base office budgets and the provost’s office.

Evaluating and Improving Programs: UAlbany’s Assessment Processes

The University’s IAP, briefly mentioned above, seeks to ensure a high-quality academic experience for its students and to promote institutional effectiveness in achieving University goals. As discussed in Chapter 2, the University’s long-term vision and goals, while somewhat dated, have been used over the self-study period to inform the UAlbany approach to assessment. Shorter-term objectives and guidance to inform assessment processes are offered by various University planning documents, such as the Mission Review II and SUNY Memorandum of Understanding compacts. Divisional and school/college strategic plans are also reviewed by relevant administrators and the assessment subcommittee. Within these frameworks, the IAP provides a road map and expectations for assessment processes that are used throughout the institution to fulfill its mission.

It is clear, in the subcommittee’s opinion, that the University believes strongly that assessment promotes operational effectiveness and efficiency across the University. While student learning may be the primary emphasis of assessment research and public concern, a comprehensive approach to assessment recognizes that the operations of administrative units also add to the complexity of the organizational milieu upon which institutional effectiveness is predicated, as they support the University’s student learning, research, and public service missions.

In the subcommittee’s opinion, it appears that the University has made important progress in developing a campus culture of assessment as well as a foundation from which future teaching and learning improvements will emerge. The University aligns the SUNY Assessment in the Major initiative with external accreditation through national associations, where such external reviews exist. Furthermore, where assessments are administered institutionally, they are complemented with a wide array of evaluations and peer reviews carried out at the departmental level. In addition, major programs are subject to approval by the undergraduate and graduate Academic Councils of the University Senate, SUNY central administration, and the State Education Department. Many of the institution’s professional programs are regularly reviewed for accreditation purposes.

As a result, the quality of Albany’s educational programs is assessed in many complementary ways by both internal and external peers, editors, reviewers, funding institutions, budget panels,
and accrediting agencies. In this context, student grades, self-reported assessments, faculty teaching evaluations, periodic program reviews, alumni studies, and assessment information about student attainment in the major all constitute complementary ways of obtaining useful feedback in order to improve learning.

In 1968, UAlbany became one the first institutions in the nation to undertake a systematic evaluation of all graduate and undergraduate programs on a regular cycle. After a decade of individual program reviews leading to the strengthening, merger and termination of many Albany programs, the University in 1978 launched a series of student-cohort studies that placed the campus in the forefront of assessment research. These assessment efforts, which have been conducted on a continual basis ever since, have given the University a rich array of evaluative databases, including student opinion surveys, cohort studies, and alumni studies.

**Compact Planning Initiative**

The University’s management team, in spring 2005, instituted the Compact Planning process as a means to establish priorities for action by academic and administrative units, as well as by the University as a whole. The University implemented the process to align University goals and strategies with activities in both academic and administrative units. The University used specific performance and outcome measures to hold academic and administrative units accountable and to demonstrate publicly the quality and impact of the University’s programs and services. 3

The faculty and/or staff within base units, under the direction of the unit head and through the interactions of the unit head and the supervisor, developed the Compact Plans. For academic Compact Plans, base units were the various academic departments; for administrative plans, the base units were determined by the vice president at a level appropriate for compact purposes. This encompassed units that had a director with budgetary authority and were accountable for particular services and performance. Deans and vice presidents bound the base unit Compact Plans together to create one Compact Plan for the school/college or division.

The Compact Planning process was short-lived due to sudden and unanticipated changes in leadership. While Compacts were used to guide selective investment decisions for two years following the start of the Compact Planning process, there has not been any institution-wide move to recommit to these plans.

Today, the University’s IAP lays out expectations for systematic and sustained efforts to develop assessment plans and timetables for implementation. Any assessment plan, whether enacted by
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3 A Compact Plan is an annual, bilateral, written management agreement between an academic or administrative unit and the University administration, and is the result of a series of meetings in which the unit leadership, as informed by its faculty and/or staff, presents priorities and issues and develops feasible strategies and targets in consultation with University administrators. Compact Plans reflect a shared and agreed upon understanding of unit and University goals and priorities.
an academic or non-academic administrative unit, should institute a continuous process of reflection and improvement over time. Units are encouraged to spread assessment activities over a multi-year period so that, in any given year, they implement at least one aspect of the assessment plan, be it the definition of learning or service goals, the development of performance metrics, data collection and analysis of results, or discussions about incorporating assessment results into curriculum review or redesigning of operations.

A secondary goal of phasing in assessment plan implementation in manageable steps is to afford units the time to discuss assessment findings with program or unit faculty, staff, and students, and to benefit from the feedback of faculty governance assemblies. A deliberately paced and managed implementation also provides opportunities to document how assessment results have been used to affirm or improve the level of student learning or service quality. The PAAC looks to the deans and vice presidents to ensure timely implementation of their units’ assessment plans.

**Divisional (Administrative) Assessment Plans**

While a diversity of approaches to assessing the administrative endeavors of administrative units is desirable and welcome, the University’s IAP specifies a standardized approach to which units undergoing assessment should adhere. However, the plan does not outline explicit guidelines or timetables for the delivery of administrative assessment plans or various assessment activities. The SUNY Student Opinion Survey (SOS), in use since the mid 1980s, has been a primary instrument for assessing student service and administrative units across vice presidential divisions. The University augments the SOS with local and nationally designed assessment instruments for administrative units.

Each University vice president is responsible for developing a divisional assessment plan that ensures that units affecting the student experience or impacting the achievement of institutional goals engage in formal assessment processes consistent with the five *UAlbany Assessment Protocol Components*. These are highlighted in the IAP. According to this *Protocol*, each assessment plan should: 1) identify goals and objectives within the framework of institutional and divisional missions; 2) develop qualitative and quantitative metrics to determine whether goals and objectives are being achieved; 3) incorporate the results of assessments into ongoing operations, planning and budgeting decisions; 4) document processes of evaluation and improvement; and 5) provide procedures for communicating assessment plans and the manner in which assessment results are used by various campus constituencies. To ensure that assessment activities are truly continuous in nature, each unit provides annual assessment progress reports to its respective vice president. However, this process would benefit from a formal assessment road map, or outline, that would allow administrative units to develop a set of formal assessment plans. Additionally, the University may want to consider assigning assessment coordinators to administrative units to provide guidance as the units develop their assessment plans.

**Academic (Program) Assessment Plans**

In accordance with existing organizational lines of reporting responsibility, deans are ultimately responsible for the development and implementation of assessment plans (according to the
UAlbany Assessment Protocol Components, noted earlier) with regard to teaching and student learning in the academic programs within their schools and colleges. The vice provost for Undergraduate Education and the dean of Graduate Studies are responsible for the assessment of University-wide programs encompassing their respective student charges.

In order to ensure that assessment plans are reasonably implemented, each dean makes sure that academic departments under their purview provide annual assessment activity reports for each academic program. Annual assessment activity reports of the academic units should 1) state the learning goals assessed in that year; 2) describe the metrics or assessment instruments used; 3) discuss assessment findings; and 4) if applicable, indicate how the findings have been used to influence the curriculum. In accordance with the preexisting practice of sharing academic assessment plans with the CAA for review and comment, deans make available to the CAA the annual assessment activity summaries for their academic programs to the CAA for review and comment. The CAA’s focus is on the process of the assessment rather than the outcome.

Academic programs adhere to assessment processes and submit assessment reports as described above. While assessment processes and reports are formal and mostly complete, there is variability in the assessment reports and assessment measures that programs use (see the Assessment Process Guidelines, Timetable and Evaluation section, below, and Part II of this report).

Departmental assessment plans and school/college activity reports are forwarded or made available the Program Review Committee of the Council on Academic Assessment (CAA) in order to keep the University community apprised of the campus assessment process, and to provide opportunities for the sharing of best practices, and a collegial review of assessment practices. Feedback from the CAA is common practice. PAAC was initially charged with annually reviewing and promoting this flow of information between various Senate councils (in addition to the CAA) and providing feedback to the authoring units. This two-way information flow was intended to provide opportunities to share best practices and for the collegial review of assessment practices. While the PAAC ceased to meet after it helped establish the campus Institutional Assessment Plan (IAP), the CAA is sufficiently filling this void through its Program Review Committee (PRC), and in cooperation with IRPE staff. In the Division for Student Success, the division’s assessment council reviews assessment plans and reports, and facilitates two-way communication between the vice president’s office and unit heads in the division.

General Education Assessment Plan

The University’s General Education Assessment Plan (GEAP) contains procedures for ensuring that the CAA’s General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC) and the vice provost for Undergraduate Education are able to determine the degree to which the University has met the learning objectives of each General Education category. GEAP also makes it possible for faculty and administrators to identify areas that need to be improved; responsibility for monitoring the effectiveness of the assessment plan resides with GEAC. Each year, several of the General Education course categories undergo review and, the following year, GEAC conducts a review
of the categories for General Education requirements. One aspect of this review includes a critical examination of the methodologies used by faculty whose courses were included in General Education assessment. In 2002, the University instituted a three-year schedule for the assessment of the General Education program.

GEAC examines course syllabi and documents it develops (Appendix 5.2 Assessment Forms 1 and 2, available at http://www.albany.edu/assessment/Gen%20Ed%20Arts%20Form%201S09.doc and http://www.albany.edu/assessment/Gen%20Ed%20Arts%20Form%202S09.doc) to collect information about the measures used to examine and reported results of student learning. The purposes of this review are to: 1) ensure that assessment methods and sample items were reported for each objective; 2) identify effective and ineffective assessment methods; and 3) make concrete suggestions for improvement, wherever possible. Members of GEAC share their findings, identify important patterns across General Education categories, then issue a report on their findings; this includes recommendations for improving areas with deficiencies.

What is evident when reviewing the University’s efforts surrounding assessment is that great progress has been made in the past five years to formalize assessment processes, make those processes routine, and modify the culture in such a way that assessment becomes a critical facet in decision-making.

Certainly, work in the area of academic assessment has laid a foundation for a sound and deliberate set of assessment processes for academic programs. It is evident that the work being done by IRPE and the CAA continues to move academic units towards more thoughtful program assessments. IRPE and the CAA are constantly improving assessment processes and recognize that process improvement is a “never-ending” journey. There is sufficient support from IRPE, the University’s academic units, their respective schools/colleges, and faculty governance to continually improve assessment activities and, as a result, assessment will remain a high priority for years to come. Regrettably, the same cannot be said of administrative assessment. While certain areas (e.g., Student Success) have implemented certain assessment activities, others administrative units are behind. Although the Compact Planning process engaged both academic and administrative units in self-evaluation, the relative brevity of the process did not lend itself to a sustained long-term effort that sought to tie unit and institutional priorities to resource allocation. The Compact Plans, however, appear to be the only occasion during which administrative units collectively engaged in a systematic evaluation of their programs and priorities. Consequently, the University should continue to enhance its academic assessment processes and increase its efforts at developing and implementing sustainable assessment processes for administrative units.

Some of the shortcomings in the area of systematic and sustained assessment appear to come as a result of executive turnover. The departure of key executives has resulted in less than full direction with regard to assessment. Although the PAAC was formed in 2004, it has not met or engaged various constituencies, most importantly vice presidential divisions, in order to advance administrative unit assessment. IRPE and the CAA have engaged schools/colleges to appoint ‘assessment liaisons’ and, this year, they have also asked academic units to appoint ‘assessment
coordinators.’ However, the efforts of IRPE and CAA would be enhanced with the reinvigoration of the PAAC. Consequently, the University should consider reconvening the PAAC to hasten the penetration of formal assessment processes throughout the University and further improve those processes.

Assessment Process: Guidelines, Timetable and Evaluation

Established procedures guide the review of undergraduate and graduate programs on a seven-year review cycle. UAlbany’s academic programs formally develop assessment plans every seven years as part of their self-studies, and implement program improvements throughout the intervening years. The approaches to developing program assessment plans have been quite varied, and this is encouraged, as each academic program is unique in its own right and necessarily tailors its assessment plan to what works for that particular program.

As indicated, periodic reviews of undergraduate and graduate programs are part of an ongoing process of programmatic self-improvement. These reviews include: the preparation of a self-study report; an external review of the self-study report; a departmental response to the external review; a review of these documents and preparation of recommendations by the CAA; and an administrative review of all recommendations resulting from the process.

In consultation with the CAA and with the provost’s approval, the vice provost for Undergraduate Education and the dean of Graduate Studies schedule program reviews. The current interim director of Program Review and Assessment coordinates the program review process. The office of either Undergraduate Education or Graduate Studies and IRPE provide administrative support. Emerging campus priorities, mandated external reviews from SUNY system administration, and accrediting, registration, and licensing bodies establish and adjust the review schedule. As mentioned earlier, guidelines and timetables for administrative unit assessments are limited.

The assessment process includes provisions for evaluating the process itself and disseminating its results. Responsibility for monitoring the effectiveness of the assessment plan resides with the CAA. The CAA oversees both assessments of academic programs (undergraduate and graduate) and the campus’s cyclical review of its General Education program, which each year assesses two to three of the 14 student learning categories on a rolling basis. The role of the CAA has steadily evolved toward being concerned with the design of academic assessment processes, and making them more formative and useful in teaching and learning. It is also empowered by its Senate charge to make recommendations to administrators and academic units for the improvement of the process.

The CAA employs two subcommittees, namely GEAC and the Program Review Committee, to perform the internal review of academic programs. GEAC examines course syllabi, General Education assessment results, and student perception surveys to report on the status of General Education and the GEAP. As with any new entity, the CAA initially struggled to clarify its role and fell behind in its review process. In 2007-2008, the Council reviewed all self-study reports completed within the previous academic year and established a schedule for reviewing all self-
study reports due during the 2008-2009 academic year. The CAA is currently reviewing ways to improve the timing of its internal review process.

The CAA has strengthened its internal assessment processes through the creation of the Program Review Committee, which reviews academic assessment reports and provides timely feedback to program and department chairs and their deans. The University could improve the CAA’s effectiveness and efficiency if it stabilized the committee’s membership, allowing it to deal with the considerable learning curve that new members face. CAA members could then devote more time and attention to assessment needs and less time to training new Senate Council members.

On the other hand, as discussed in Chapter 4, issues around Senate Council membership turnover and the need to foster broader faculty participation in Senate activities must also be considered in this equation. Outside the CAA, some academic units have streamlined assessment activities, which prevents overloading the faculty and helps focus efforts on developing quality assessment tools. The University needs a mechanism for quickly sharing best practices as they emerge in the academic units. The “Student Outcomes Annual Reports 2007-2008” lists additional recommendations that would assist academic departments in advancing their assessment plans and activities. A review of annual assessment activity reports revealed a lack of clarity in how faculty use the assessment results. The distinction between drafting a plan and actually executing it is also key; it is unclear how consistently these assessments turn into concrete change. This finding suggests that assessment planning at UAlbany could lead to more subsequent changes in programs. Therefore, the University should continue to educate faculty about the programmatic benefits of assessment, and encourage new ideas on how to improve the assessment planning process.

On an annual basis, each of the University’s nine schools/colleges submits a School/College Report to IRPE. These reports, compiled since 2006/2007, encompass the respective school’s/college’s assessment activities for the preceding year. IRPE and CAA review these reports and offer constructive feedback to the academic units and associated deans. The self-study reports, external reviews, departmental responses, and IRPE and CAA feedback are available from the 2002 – 2003 academic year to the present. Additionally, the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in the Major is a summary report on campus-based assessments of student learning outcomes in undergraduate majors. These reports also date back to the 2002 – 2003 academic year.

Academic Program Assessments

As mentioned, assessments of graduate and undergraduate programs at UAlbany occur on a seven-year cycle. The process consists of a program self-study and report, a site visit by external reviewers, an external reviewer report, administrative and governance review of the documents, administrative and governance recommendations to the program, a departmental response to the recommendations, and a departmental plan for ongoing program improvement. The process itself requires the involvement not only of faculty, staff and students from within the department or program, but also that of individuals from outside the unit. IRPE is involved throughout the process as a resource for information and assistance to programs. The self-study report is distributed to external reviewers as well as to campus administration (vice provost for
Undergraduate Education and/or dean of Graduate Studies). The external reviewer report and a summary assessment report are submitted to SUNY system administration. All assessment documents are submitted to the CAA. Additionally, the provost’s office requests an annual report from each college describing their assessment activities.

To evaluate the quality of various aspects of the assessment plans, the Middle States self-study Subcommittee on Academic Assessment selected 16 academic units that represented a range of substantive programs in the sciences, arts, humanities, and professions (Table 5.3). Twelve of the programs had no formal accreditation processes, while the remaining four programs, namely Masters of Social Work, Masters in Regional Planning, Information Science/MSIS, and the School of Business, had associated accreditation processes. (The subcommittee did not evaluate the programs themselves; rather the subcommittee evaluated the programs’ assessment plans.)

The Subcommittee on Academic Assessment used an assessment plan rubric to evaluate the assessment plans, which contained multiple assessment domains. The rubric’s domains correspond to those that appear in the Middle States Institutional Self-Study Design document, viz., a clear mission statement, articulated learning objectives, a design for the program that meets the learning objectives, an evaluation of current student learning opportunities, a candid appraisal of faculty, a clear plan for subsequent assessments, an evaluation of resources and facilities, and overall conclusions. The rubric’s domains (Table 5.4) are also consistent with the University’s 1998 Strategic Plan goals. Two independent raters reviewed each assessment plan on each of the domains. Raters categorized each assessment plan domain as “excellent” or “needs improvement.” For example, an assessment plan’s mission statement received an “excellent” rating if it was clearly stated and adhered to the University’s mission. A mission statement received a “needs improvement” rating if it was incompatible with the University’s mission statement. (Domains in the “needs improvement” category could still contain substantial useful information without reaching “excellent.”) The inter-rater reliability averaged over 70%.

The examination of the assessment plans reveals several recurring themes. First and foremost, assessment plans have clearly become extensive and detailed. The process is obviously effortful for the participating programs and undoubtedly takes time away from other aspects of teaching, scholarship, and administration. Thus, any changes to alter the assessment process that develops the plans must lead to benefits that outweigh the costs of the time involved to implement those changes.

The assessment plan domain received the highest number (87%) of “excellent” ratings among all domains considered. Programs consistently articulated a process for continued direct and indirect assessments of student learning. Most of these emphasized quantitative as well as qualitative methods of assessments. The best of these also detailed plans to use the information to improve the program. The domains involving mission statements and learning outcomes were close behind the assessment domain, with over 80% of programs receiving an “excellent” rating. Mission statements were clear and dovetailed nicely with the University’s mission. They also appeared consistent with other aspects of the program, including their design, the strengths of the faculty and students, and the available resources. Learning outcomes reflected the stated mission
of the program and lent themselves to simple, intuitively appealing measurement. The best assessments of learning outcomes clearly delineated what a graduate would have learned.

Evaluations of faculty and the conclusions drawn in the assessments received the next best rankings, with 75% of programs receiving “excellent” ratings in these domains. The best assessments of faculty quality included current vitae, elaboration on current teaching and scholarship, and linkage of these to the mission statement. Those assessments that needed improvement often neglected to include recent vitae. Ensuring that current vitae are included should prove an easy way to improve assessments in this domain. The conclusions drawn in each assessment were also comparably strong. The best articulated a five-year plan that incorporated the findings of the assessment itself. Those that received “needs improvement” ratings often had intriguing goals but failed to articulate a timetable or plan of action. Connecting the results of the assessment to those that were detailed in the study’s conclusions seems a good way to improve in this domain without adding inordinate labor.

The assessments of student opportunities and the designs of the programs received the next highest ratings, with over 68% of the assessment plans receiving an “excellent” mark. The best assessments of student opportunities revealed numerous experiences that required work outside of the classroom, but built on classroom learning. These experiences were consistent with the program’s stated mission. These assessments also included a sense of the number of students that participated in these experiences. Program assessments judged to need improvement in this domain frequently failed to include details of out-of-class experiences or had few available. Designs for programs were comparably strong. The best of these explained the sequence of coursework and other experiences with a clear rationale for the progression. They also included details about the advisement process that led students through the appropriate experiences. The few that needed improvement often left out details about advisement, which seems easily remedied.

The weakest domain of the assessments concerned evaluations of resources and facilities, which frequently went unmentioned. Only 50% of programs received an “excellent” rating in this domain. This assessment of resources and facilities is one of the few that is consistently subpar. Perhaps programs did not emphasize this domain because of a perception that changes in facilities and resources might prove difficult. Future assessments can include more details on perceptions of support, resources, and facilities, and could actually help the University’s overall planning and budgeting processes by having needs more clearly demonstrated and tied to program goals. Without a clear description of the facilities, resources, and support available to a program, it is difficult to assess whether they are adequate to support the program’s mission and goals.

Based on the above analyses, the University may consider asking programs to enhance their assessment reports by having them include timetables for implementing plans related to the conclusions drawn in their assessments. This procedure would ensure that program improvements occur in a straightforward manner. Programs should also include the current vitae of all faculty and staff, and should elaborate on the role of out-of-class experiences when appropriate. Explanations and examples of activities outside of standard lectures and seminars,
including supervised research, would also strengthen the assessments. Moreover, assessment reports should detail exactly how advisement works, especially with regard to its impact on the sequencing of courses and how these dovetail with program goals. Finally, all programs should provide detailed comments about available support, resources, and facilities that can lead to concrete recommendations for improvement.

**Administrative Department Assessments**

As mentioned above, the University used the Compact Planning process for a short time (2005-2007). Each academic and administrative unit submitted a detailed report that included its mission and function, goals and objectives, proposed initiatives, and an assessment plan for each initiative. The Selective Investment Committee reviewed all Compact Plans and prioritized them, then budget and resource allocations were made to those units determined to have the highest priority initiatives related to the overall University mission and goals. The Compact Planning process was initially intended to be an ongoing process that would align University goals and strategies.

Even though the Compact Planning process was not formally continued on campus, some administrative units found the process beneficial to their operations and have continued similar efforts on their own by routinely looking at their goals and objectives and considering new initiatives to help further those goals, as well as the overall University goals. Most notably, the units within the Division of Student Success have continued a formal assessment process, with each unit completing an annual report of its assessment activities and results as they relate to the unit’s mission and goals. The division has created a Student Success Assessment Committee, which serves as an internal resource for the subunits as they develop assessment plans and reports. It also advises the Vice President for Student Success. There are also two subcommittees, the Assessment Planning Subcommittee, which reviews unit assessment plans and reports, and the Assessment Report Subcommittee, which reviews executive summaries and reports concerning divisional assessment activities.

Many of the administrative units at UAlbany, with the exception of the Division for Student Success, do not have formal assessment plans in place to evaluate their performance and goals achievement. That does not mean, however, that there are not informal assessment activities in place. In order to evaluate the quality of assessment activities in the administrative departments, two divisions that include solely administrative units were chosen for more in-depth review. Some of the units within each division are student service offices, while others have little or no student contact. The divisions chosen were the Division of Finance and Business and the Division of Student Success. As in the review of academic program assessments, the adequacy of the assessments in place, and not the quality of the offices, was evaluated.

The assessments of the units in these divisions appear to require individualized sets of domains and criteria. For example, ongoing Finance and Business activities help ensure that the units meet aspects of their missions in fiscally responsible ways. In a sense, external audits by both independent accounting firms, federal and state agencies, and SUNY for many of the units (State Accounting, Sponsored Funds Financial Management, Purchasing and Contracts, Equipment
Management, Human Resources, and the Student Loan Services Center) serve as a form of assessment for Finance and Business units. Another example is customer satisfaction surveys conducted by Parking and Mass Transit, as well as Facilities Management. The campus also has a state-mandated internal control program that provides periodic reviews of each unit’s missions, goals, policies, procedures, and operations. The reviews are performed jointly by the campus’ assistant internal control coordinator, associate counsel, and information security officer. While these reviews and testing are not as structured or detailed as the assessments of academic programs, they do help provide another view of the operations of each unit on campus.

The units within the Division of Student Success have a number of formal assessment processes that are more consistent with those sought by academic units and the University’s IAP. These various assessment processes include each unit submitting an annual report of its activities each year, creating a three-year assessment plan that outlines the various assessment activities to be undertaken in a given year, maintaining assessment dashboards or key performance indicators as well as developing and updating during the course of the year a series of strategic priorities. All assessment activities relate to the unit’s mission and goals. Additionally, each unit has a designated assessment coordinator charged with overseeing assessment activities in their unit.

At the divisional level, there is a Student Success Assessment Council, which serves as an internal resource for the subunits as they develop assessment plans and reports. It also advises the vice president for Student Success. There are also two subcommittees, the Assessment Planning Subcommittee, which reviews unit assessment plans and reports, and the Assessment Report Subcommittee, which reviews executive summaries and reports concerning divisional assessment activities. Additionally, the division maintains an extensive assessment Website (www.albany.edu/studentaffairs/assessment) which also includes the annual briefing book that features data from each of the division’s 13 units. The vice president’s office also maintains a five year division-wide assessment plan and oversees unit self-studies each summer. Most recently, the division partnered with StudentVoice, a national student affairs assessment organization, to further facilitate the assessment of programs and services division-wide.

**Part II. Assessment of Student Learning**

**Integrating Situational Outcomes with Goals**

At the institutional level, assessment of student learning outcomes is integrated into the University at Albany Goals and Priorities. Assessment of student learning outcomes is also integrated into the University's statement of strategic planning, as described in Appendix A of Charting the Future: Creating a New Learning Environment for the 21st Century A statement of strategic values, which appeared in 1998. Within this document, Strategic Value #1, Engaged Learning, is said to focus on "the active and enthusiastic involvement of both students and faculty with the learning process – at every stage and level. Faculty and students will come together in a common quest to appreciate inherited wisdom of the past and to participate in the discovery of new knowledge.”
At the program and course levels, alignment to those University values is demonstrated in multiple ways. At the program level, the University reviews all academic programs on a periodic basis, including yearly assessment reports. Some programs maintain separate subject-specific national or regional accreditation. As detailed previously, the University’s programs engage in a self-study on a seven-year cycle. The University's Procedures for the Joint Review of Undergraduate and Graduate Programs, Part V, requires that assessment plans be filed, assessment results be reviewed annually, and that feedback/improvement loops be part of an iterative process to assess and improve student learning.

To support the assessment of student learning in each academic unit, the University developed a Practitioner's Guide to Program Review. As noted earlier, the position of director of Program Review and Assessment was created in 2002 to provide support to all academic units, track assessment activities, and report results to the CAA and the provost. A Web page documenting the assessment process, with related links, is available at http://www.albany.edu/assessment/index.html.

By reviewing learning outcomes, providing feedback on assessment methodology and encouraging the use of assessment data to promote enhanced student learning through curricular and pedagogical change, the University is actively seeking to provide “clarity of purpose and coherence in our curriculum,” a guiding principle of the UAlbany’s 1998 Strategic Plan.

Guided by this institutional system, 19 academic programs within 16 academic units (Table 5.3) were reviewed by the subcommittee, as were 43 randomly selected course syllabi (Table 5.5) for evidence of program and course-level use of clearly stated student learning objectives. Of the programs reviewed, all 19 programs specifically listed or named expected student learning objectives. This often took the form of a matrix that listed program goals with connected student assessments. For the 43 syllabi requested, three were not submitted and three were independent study courses without a syllabus requirement. Of 37 remaining, 29 had clearly stated student learning outcomes and eight syllabi did not provide any information about student learning outcomes. The syllabi displayed a range of basic to more elaborate means of showing outcomes, such as a short listing of subject-specific learning goals to longer lists connecting the course content to programmatic assessment requirements. For independent studies, student learning outcomes are generally incorporated in the agreement form, which, upon agreeing on a study topic both faculty and students sign. Overall, the data collection indicated 100% of the programs specifically listed student learning objectives and 78% of the syllabi reviewed included clearly stated student learning outcomes. University policy requires that course syllabi for the General Education courses always list learning outcomes for this category of classes.

At the heart of UAlbany’s assessment system is program-level decision-making about learning outcome goals and assessments. Each program’s faculty members make decisions about learning goals and how to assess those goals, both at a course and overall program level. This discipline-related process is important for national accreditation and external review systems in which disciplines have unique standards, routines, and expectations. In the UAlbany assessment process, the external reviews provide critical insight into how particular programs meet the relevant goals of the extended discipline. These discipline-related program decisions connect to the institutional learning outcome goals and mission-related practices in a variety of ways. First,
as outlined in the Practitioner’s Guide to Program Review, the program-learning goals are a critical component of the annual assessment process, including the related assessments of those goals. Second, there are University-wide assessment processes, such as surveys of student opinions and experiences. With results provided on University Websites and at meetings, these assessments do provide some insight into University goals and expectations in terms of the questions and foci of the surveys. Third, there are numerous review processes at both the development stages of courses and programs (e.g., University academic councils) and for the long-term and ongoing program assessment (e.g., Council on Academic Assessment). In turn, these councils report to the University Senate, which advises the provost on academic matters. While these institutional-level practices contribute to the overall assessment system, they do not on their own provide a set of institutional-level learning outcome goals.

Assessment of Student Learning
Appendix C of the Practitioner's Guide to Program Review includes a list of examples for direct evidence of student learning. The list includes:

- Student work in capstone courses
- Student portfolios
- ETS/GRE items
- Pre-test, post-test program exams
- Licensure exam items
- Performances and presentations
- Comprehensive examinations
- Master's thesis or doctoral dissertation

A review of annual assessment activity reports and self-study reports for all 64 programs in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and seven additional programs across the University reveals that all annual assessment activity reports and the most recent self-study reports overwhelmingly show the use of direct evidence of student learning. Only four did not show any direct evidence in 2007-08. Programs that are nationally accredited, such as the Bachelor's of Social Welfare and Master's of Social Welfare in the School of Social Welfare and the programs in the School of Business also have assessment plans that include direct evidence. When reviewing the assessment data, it is apparent that many of these programs also had indirect evidence of student learning and many were using this evidence to direct program improvements.

A review of the 19 programs, including both annual assessment activity reports and self-study reports, revealed that a majority of programs had clearly stated student learning goals with specific assessments attached. However, the programs had a broad range in terms of the quality of these assessments and the specific acknowledgement of how these assessments might be used to inform decision-making. For example, some programs relied primarily on course-level data, such as a course grade or course-specific assignments. In one case, a single course was responsible for covering all program goals and assessing them. However, across programs there
were many instances of multiple assessments providing a wide range of assessment information that had the potential to inform program decision-making.

A review of annual assessment activity reports revealed a lack of clarity in how faculty use the assessment results. Each report asks simply to record “changes/planned changes,” but does not ask for details. The reports submitted for 2007-08 indicated that programs made changes to teaching, curriculum and programs, but the majority of these changes do not appear to link directly back to evidence of student learning. In CAS, for instance, a review of all annual assessment activity reports indicated that less than one third (27.5%) of the programs indicated changes/planned changes that were strongly linked to the assessment results, another 5% were moderately linked, while over half (53.5%) were weakly linked.

As discussed in Part I of this report, UAlbany employs a well-documented, organized, systematic, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning. This includes program, department, and University levels of assessment. Within this process, a review of annual assessment activity reports and self-study reports indicates a wide range of qualitative and/or quantitative measures used across campus. Across campus, many degrees rely on standard measures such as course grades, overall GPA, and a culminating experience (e.g., portfolio). Beyond that, individual measures are closely aligned to the disciplines: one program might value recitals/performances and another a licensure exam. In many ways, the assessments used for self-study seemed to reflect the expertise and experience of program faculty engaged in the specific type of program assessment. For example, one nationally accredited degree listed multiple assessments (e.g., surveys, field ratings, licensure exams), while a few of the degrees newer to this process focused on internal assessments, such as a course grade and overall GPA.

**Faculty and Staff Collaboration**

Assessment of learning has affected collaboration in several significant ways. Within schools and departments, faculty and staff use assessment data to shape curriculum within programs. By drawing other faculty into the process of defining learning goals and collecting data, a much larger group of faculty within each department or school is becoming involved in the collaborative process of evaluating curriculum and learning success within courses. Beyond the program level, University-wide curriculum committees at the undergraduate and graduate levels review curricular changes; these are approved at many levels, in some cases involving the University Senate and approval of the president.

The interim director of Program Review and Assessment reviews all annual assessment activity reports and provides feedback, thereby facilitating ideas and best practices across the campus, while allowing units to develop their own assessment of learning processes in ways that are unique and meaningful to them. The CAA reviews these reports. Through CAA, the faculty, staff, and administrators can vet practices and provide feedback to improve assessment processes throughout the University. At the University level, the Institute for Teaching, Learning, and Academic Leadership (ITLAL) hosts workshops and consults with faculty individually, or in groups, to help develop best practices and assessment models spanning undergraduate curriculum, General Education, and different academic units. Finally, assessment seminars...
hosted by the provost’s office have been held annually since 2006. These seminars provide a means for chairs, deans and school/college liaisons to learn more about the University's assessment processes and results from the prior year’s assessment cycle activities, and foster the sharing of assessment information with additional faculty.

**Student Participation in Assessment**

Student learning is at the heart of the assessment of learning. Students are involved in the assessment process through membership on curriculum committees in some academic units; in addition, both graduate and undergraduate student representatives are invited to join CAA to review, critique, and comment on assessment reports and issues. For many years, students have participated in the University’s Student Instructional Rating Form (SIRF) course evaluations or departmentally-developed alternatives for feedback. In 2008, ITLAL initiated a new mid-course feedback process, where invited students, in some cases, are able to help shape mid-semester course changes that improve their learning on a just-in-time basis.

Student feedback is included in units via programmatic, exit (graduation) and alumni surveys. These indirect measures of student learning are considered alongside direct measures in providing information used in curricular reform. As was previously mentioned, learning goals are present within a majority of course syllabi, bringing students into the learning process by clearly identifying what they are to learn. In some instances, programmatic learning goals are displayed on Websites and discussed in new student orientation programs, which involve students actively in their own personal learning process. One department publishes learning goals on bookmarks that are given to all students at the beginning of their graduate program. Students who are told up front what to expect from the program of study become partners in the attainment of that knowledge and/or voice feedback if those programmatic learning goals are not accomplished. In most of the program-related site visits for both national accreditation and internal program review, auditors/reviewers meet with students to further attain information about their views on courses, assessments, and program development; these meetings provide relevant feedback to faculty members on program objectives and assessments. Self-studies within departments and programs can include focus groups with faculty, staff, and students. Many also invite external reviewers from comparable programs and departments to provide detailed feedback.

**Dissemination of Assessment Results**

Self-studies involve department and program faculty; the review of self-study reports involves University faculty and staff. Reports are available to anyone in the University community needing examples of program reviews. Certain confidentiality restrictions apply; current protocol, established by the CAA in fall 2007, discourages the electronic sharing of self-study to limit the sharing of sensitive information. Upon request, the interim director of Program Review and Assessment will provide a hard copy of a requested self-study report, given the approval by the department chair.
Following the self-study and site visit, the Program Review Committee of the CAA reviews the documents. Membership on CAA and its subcommittees includes faculty and professional staff from different programs, schools and colleges across the University. Current practice is for the CAA to review and share a report with the chair and the dean within one academic year of the site visit. This shift to a one-year response stems from faculty concerns in earlier years that the feedback needed a faster schedule in order for faculty to consider and potentially implement suggested changes. The process facilitates the dissemination, analysis and discussion at the University level and communication among all academic units.

While the self-study has always included a section on assessment and the expectation that assessment would be ongoing and continually inform improvements, annual reporting has been inconsistent. The provost’s office requested annual assessment activity reports from each academic unit; academic programs now submit annual assessment activity reports on assessment activities, results and changes/planned changes made subsequent to the prior report. School and college liaisons (i.e., primarily deans, assistant deans, and a vice dean) prepare a report summarizing the activities and submit this and assessment matrices to the interim director of Program Review and Assessment, who provides written feedback to each school, college, and program, as well to the provost. All of these documents are shared with the CAA.

In terms of general review, deans of the schools and colleges are copied on emails about the reports and feedback from the Interim Director of Program Review and Assessment, but the school/college liaisons share the actual documents with school or college faculty. At the program/departmental level there is no official protocol for how assessment results are disseminated, analyzed, or discussed among the faculty, or with external stakeholders, and consequently little public information about the University’s academic assessments is available. The University initiated a formal assessment review process by the CAA in August 2008 (focusing at that time on 2007-08 assessment activities). The CAA now annually reviews the school and college reports, assessment matrices, feedback, and reports to make recommendations for improving assessment. Currently, the reports and feedback are not shared in writing with the University faculty or students. That said, the provost’s Annual Assessment Seminar (2005, 2008, 2009) is used as a vehicle to share information on campus assessment activities with deans, chairs and school/college assessment liaisons. The information provided typically focuses on departmental assessment reports and processes, shared best practices, and discussion of results and assessment strategies.

Quality of Assessment Processes

The quality of student learning assessment processes and outcomes is fundamental to the University’s educational processes in that it enables the University to determine how well (or poorly) its programs are performing in terms of a central goal, namely student learning. The University cannot be sure if its educational processes are effective without articulating learning outcomes, designing and implementing suitable assessments, and interpreting the associated results. Thus, an examination of assessment processes is crucial.
As part of the campus’s Middle States self-study preparation, 16 academic programs (Table 5.3) were reviewed by the Subcommittee to assess the quality of their assessment processes. Self-study reports, annual assessment activity reports, feedback on those reports from the Interim Director of Program Review and Assessment, student-learning-outcomes annual reports, and, when available, external accreditation reports were reviewed. To perform the review, the subcommittee created the rubric depicted in Table 5.6 and used it to evaluate the quality of the assessments and stated outcomes. The domains assessed are listed in the left-most column, and the columns to the right denote the degree to which the domain is considered “Exemplary,” “Adequate,” “Inadequate,” or simply “Unavailable.”

Within the context of this evaluation rubric, “assessments” include either direct or indirect assessments of student learning outcomes. A summary of the analysis of the quality of assessments and outcomes by dimension is provided below:

- **Comprehensive Domain:** Nearly all the programs met this criterion. The three that did not neglected to report on their masters and/or doctoral programs.

- **Guidelines Domain:** Though every program reported some kind of student learning outcomes, only eight had learning outcomes for specific courses and/or levels and included direct as well as indirect measures. The remaining programs either listed only topics to be covered, or reported limited direct or (more commonly) indirect measures of student learning outcomes.

- **Responsibility Domain:** About one-third of the programs failed to indicate who took responsibility for designing, administering, scoring, and reporting assessment results. Of the programs that delegated responsibility, five suggested that the burden of assessment was adequately distributed, and five revealed that one or a few faculty members do the “lion’s share” of the assessment work. Fortunately, none of these programs appeared to be inappropriately delegating assessment responsibilities.

- **Timetables Domain:** For a little over half of the programs, the assessment timetables appeared to be either “quick” or “reasonable.” Two programs had six-year cycles, which may be too long to be useful, and four failed to report clear timetables.

- **Investment Domain:** The adequacy of institutional resources for assessment was the most under-reported feature. Over half of the programs reviewed did not discuss it at all. The remaining programs either implied that investment in assessment was adequate, or revealed that assessment occurred in spite of inadequate resources.

- **Practical but Useful Domain:** This criterion was difficult to judge because the review documents (e.g., annual assessment activity reports) did not provide details regarding the actual assessments used. (Consequently, concerning this domain, conclusions should be considered tentative.) Eight of the programs appeared to rely on feasible, useful assessments. Three of them relied on assessments that are valued but challenging to implement. One program admitted that one of its valued assessments – portfolios – was not feasible as student enrollment increased. Four programs failed to indicate the practicality or usefulness of their assessments.
• Evidence Domain: Only one program provided sufficient, convincing evidence of student achievement of both institutional and program-learning outcomes. Ten programs provided evidence for some, but not all outcomes. Common oversights included an overreliance on indirect measures, including alumni surveys, rather than direct measures of learning.

In summary, the review suggests that the programs are generally attempting to comply with both internal and external mandates to report on assessment processes, assessments, and outcomes, but several key areas are in need of improvement. Clearly, the University needs to define assessments and student learning outcomes and directly measure learning. Fortunately, there is evidence of progress in these areas (e.g., some programs have made significant improvements in reporting on student learning over the past three years). The tendency of programs to neglect institutional learning outcomes is understandable in light of the relative salience of the 10-year-old institutional goals and the lack of clarity concerning which University goal statements should be addressed—the 1998 Statement of Strategic Goals and Values or the 2006 Draft University Goals and Priorities. Nonetheless, if University-wide learning outcomes are to have meaning, they must be addressed in academic assessment plans. The lack of convincing evidence of student learning is in need of redress if the University is to improve the quality of education students receive. Finally, the University needs to assess whether the resources—namely, people, time and money—it dedicates to supporting schools and departments in their articulation of learning outcomes, measurements (direct and indirect) of learning, and uses of assessment data to improve programs, are sufficient or not. As part of that support assessment, the University should consider professional development training to increase the level of assessment-literacy among the faculty.

Regular Evaluation of Student Learning Assessment Processes

CAA reviews the academic assessment process with contributions from several members of the University (e.g., vice provost for Undergraduate Education, dean of Graduate Studies). CAA’s Program Review Committee and GEAC review academic programs and the General Education program, respectively. CAA can recommend changes in assessment policies and procedures. The Council as a whole meets at least once a month, often more, throughout the academic year and takes up issues as they arise. Its Program Review and GEACs meet multiple times each month as well. CAA not only engages in a periodic review, but has ongoing discussions among its members about how assessment processes, assessment, and outcomes should be improved.

Administrative Support for Improvements in Assessment and Student Learning

When deficiencies in student learning are uncovered, the Interim Director of Program Review and Assessment informs the program’s faculty and provides substantive feedback about the areas requiring immediate attention. Additionally, CAA contacts the department chair and/or program director and provides feedback about troublesome areas. It may also recommend that individual instructors contact ITLAL to discuss the areas of concern and potential solutions for improving them. For example, University feedback on the 2006-2007 annual assessment activity reports
encouraged several departments to contact the director of ITLAL to obtain help on sharpening the measures of the objectives and on developing methods to better measure the objectives.

ITLAL provides a wide array of services to UAlbany’s faculty, offering them help if they need to improve their classroom assessment techniques or establish a clearer set of learning objectives for their courses. ITLAL is an invaluable resource for helping individual departments improve and sharpen their learning objectives, as well as detecting and correcting pedagogical problems. The University also supports other departments that deal with the deficiencies in student learning, such as the Office of Academic Support Services and the Writing Center.

A decade ago, the Trustees of the State University of New York mandated system-wide General Education requirements; they were implemented in 2000. The Trustees then mandated assessment of student learning outcomes. Initially, the Undergraduate Academic Council’s Subcommittee on General Education Assessment, which was later moved to CAA, reviewed the General Education program, and found that students have continually met the program’s learning objectives since its assessment began in 2002-03. Consistent with UAlbany’s General Education Assessment Plan, evidence of student learning consists of data collected on student learning activities, which are designed to capture the General Education learning objectives, syllabi analyses, and student self-perception surveys.

The campus submits annual General Education reports to SUNY system administration that summarize its student achievement levels from course-embedded assessments. If the reports reveal that students are falling below University-set standards, the University would need to make corrective changes to its General Education program. An overwhelming majority of UAlbany students meet or exceed these standards. The system-wide General Education requirements, in some areas (e.g., mathematics) are below the level one would expect of UAlbany students.

The University has more data on student attitudes than on student learning. In most disciplines, there are neither standardized national exams nor an agreed-upon undergraduate curriculum. The University relies on other objective indicators of program quality (e.g., number of students who pursue graduate studies, success in securing employment, and performance in capstone courses) and on indirect self-reported measures of student learning. Students rate courses and instructors as “very effective,” “effective,” “moderately effective,” “ineffective,” or “very ineffective.”

As noted in the chapter section on Institutional Effectiveness, the campus conducts triennial student opinion surveys, and in 2008 it participated in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) for the first time. The NSSE results were shared with deans and chairs, and by them with their faculties. The results of the 2008 NSSE survey administration are being considered at this writing, in conjunction with the First-Year Experience Taskforce and the Writing Panel report to develop initiatives to bolster the undergraduate experience.

During years when budgets are not being reduced, departmental allocations (e.g., replacing retirees, teaching assistantships, adjunct positions, office staff support) are driven by myriad considerations other than course quality, as determined by measurements of student learning.
Course demand – supplying enough seats for enrolled students – is usually a more immediate priority than course quality. Assessments of student learning do not drive budget allocations or course offerings, but nonetheless do have a longer-term goal of improving course quality.

The University regularly gauges students’ opinions on instructor evaluation forms to identify weak courses and/or poor instructors, and to ensure student satisfaction with the instruction they receive. The University also monitors more general student satisfaction with courses and other aspects of the academic (and non-academic) environment in its triennial Student Opinion Survey (SOS). Campus strategies for recruiting students, and for other initiatives – including strengthening advising and improving course availability, rest appreciably on information from this and other survey efforts.

It is difficult to know the degree to which academic assessments influence campus policies and individual departments. School/college and departmental assessment reports detail to some degree how assessments of student learning are being conducted, but the integration of these assessments with formal academic planning processes is nascent. Many issues addressed in departmental assessments are factored into the administration’s view and treatment of individual departments. The data that may play the biggest role (e.g., outside funding, faculty publications, demand for courses, numbers of low enrollment courses, and general level of student satisfaction with courses and instructors) are available from the University and do not require departmental assessments. The latter, because they are so detailed, are most valuable as instruments to guide a department’s internal reflections.

**Institutional Use of Student Learning Assessment Information**

The University has undertaken a number of initiatives to assess multiple aspects of students’ academic and non-academic experiences. Every three years, UAlbany administers an SOS, a practice which began in 1980; the last published report was issued in 2009, following a spring 2009 survey administration. These particular survey data are self-reported. Their primary value is for tracking almost three decades of changes in student perceptions about their UAlbany educations.

In 2005, a subcommittee of the University Senate reanalyzed the spring 2003 SOS data, conducted a follow-up survey, and made a number of recommendations to improve specific aspects of student-faculty interaction and the teaching effectiveness of instructors. The subcommittee’s study stimulated discussions among faculty, but the report did not lead to formal recommendations from the Senate.

In the springs of 2005, 2006, and 2007, UAlbany administered an internally developed instrument, the Student Experience Survey, which relies on self-reported data for learning. The University assembled the data comparing individual departments and programs, and it shared information about best practices originating from the departments whose students were most satisfied with course experiences and academic advisement.
Responding to concern among faculty with student writing, a Blue Ribbon Writing Panel was created in 2006. This panel identified significant weaknesses in the campus’s approach to writing instruction and recommended changes whose estimated annual cost would be about $422,000.\(^4\) Whether or not the University can implement the panel’s recommendations, given current budgetary constraints remains to be seen, and they remain on the provost’s desk at this writing.

Currently, the University is studying the First-Year Experience, including Project Renaissance, which seeks to create a small-college and community living atmosphere, along with an integrated, interdisciplinary curriculum. Initially funded partly by an outside grant, Project Renaissance now relies on non-tenure track faculty. While the student life aspects of this program are widely viewed as successful (confirmed both by student surveys and retention data), concern among faculty over its academic aspects was one of several motivations that gave rise to the study, conducted during summer and fall 2008.

A recent survey of 2007 bachelor’s degree recipients found that a majority secured employment within one year of graduation and almost all of the remaining degree recipients were continuing their studies. The survey showed that 86% of UAlbany’s graduates remained in New York State and 84% of those who were continuing their studies were doing so at New York institutions. A spring 2008 survey-based study of present graduate students examined issues ranging from their satisfaction with academic program to student life (extra-curricular) and financial issues. The survey’s results were made publicly available on the Assessment Report Webpage of IRPE\(^5\), and program-specific results were provided to the programs’ respective chairs, directors, and deans.

The University's efforts to assess student learning suggest a number of recommendations, which are listed in Appendix 5.1:

---


APPENDICES

Appendix 5.1 Summary of Recommendations

- To promote more information sharing of assessment data and information, the University should develop a formal policy and set of procedures that promote the proactive and open sharing of assessment information to both internal and external stakeholders.

- UAlbany should continue to enhance the processes associated with academic assessment while increasing efforts towards more systemic and sustained assessment processes for administrative units.

- The provost’s Assessment Advisory Committee should be reconvened as a means of engaging and better coordinating academic and non-academic units, University governance, and administration in the timely sharing of assessment information.

- Much like the academic units, “assessment coordinators” should be assigned at the unit and divisional levels to facilitate assessment activities in each vice presidential area.

- To distribute assessment best practices that emerge in the academic units, the University needs to develop a mechanism for quickly sharing those best practices.

- The following five recommendations pertain to the specific content that academic program review self-studies should contain; each academic program self-study should:
  - Always include the current vitae of all program faculty as part of its assessment plan
  - Explain precisely how student advisement works, with special attention to its impact on the sequence of coursework and program goals
  - Include content on the out-of-class experiences for students
  - Consistently provide detailed comments about available support, resources and facilities, with recommendations for improvement
  - Include timetables for implementing plans related to the conclusions of the assessment process.

- To improve the quality of assessments, the University needs to better articulate practical assessments and student learning outcomes and directly – rather than indirectly – measure learning.

- To have standard assessment procedures attached to the institutional mission, the University should collectively create outcomes that are common across academic disciplines and which encourage academic units to align with those outcomes, while also adding discipline-specific outcomes to individual assessment programs.
- UAlbany should evaluate the adequacy of resources that support assessment processes in the schools and colleges.
- To connect assessment data and program improvement, the University needs to extend its support to academic programs and departments so that assessment experts can guide faculty in addressing needed areas of improvement.
Appendix 5.2 Sample Assessment Forms 1 and 2


The length of these documents precludes including them in this appendix.

Appendix 5.3: Academic Programs Reviewed

Chemistry          Music
Biology            Anthropology/Human Biology
Public Policy      Educational Administration and Policy Studies
Sociology          Criminal Justice
Psychology         Masters of Social Work
Russian            Masters in Regional Planning
East Asian Studies Information Science/MSIS
Art History        School of Business
### Appendix 5.4 Assessment Plan Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Clearly stated mission that adheres to the mission of the University</td>
<td>Mission statement is not compatible with program operation; relationship to University mission statement is absent or not compatible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Outcomes are detailed, substantive, and reflective of program mission; stated learning outcomes are measurable</td>
<td>Outcomes are not reflective of student learning; outcomes are not observable and not able to be adequately assessed as written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Design</td>
<td>Program is described in detail; course structure and rationale of sequencing is clear and consistent; advisement procedures are described and quality of advisement is reviewed or assessed</td>
<td>Consistent information is available in the graduate bulletin and website; no description provided of how advisement is provided or assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Quality</td>
<td>Clearly describes academic opportunities for students in the program; program offers substantial out-of-class experiences to enhance classroom learning</td>
<td>Does not describe program opportunities in the program; it is not clear what students can do outside of taking classes to meet program mission and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Quality</td>
<td>Faculty vitae are current; narrative describes recent research, teaching, and scholarship to promote program mission</td>
<td>Faculty vitae not complete or outdated; incomplete narrative describing faculty scholarship and teaching; document suggests a lack of current scholarly activity among the faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Plan</td>
<td>Detailed plan to directly and indirectly assess student learning outcomes; includes rigorous qualitative and quantitative methods; describes how information obtained will be used to improve the program</td>
<td>Assessment plan does not assess student outcomes; plan does not include a timetable for continuous assessment initiatives or how assessment data will be used to improve the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support, Resources, and Facilities</td>
<td>Tables accurately reflect the past five years and the section supplements the tables with a descriptive interpretation of the data presented</td>
<td>Incomplete information on support, resources and facilities over the last five years; missing important information (e.g., library holdings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>Forward thinking based vision for the next five years is clearly stated; demonstrates intention to use results of self-study data to plan for the future</td>
<td>Describes a survival mode; does not make reasonable five year goals; program does not articulate steps to meet those goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 5.5 List of Syllabi Reviewed for Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog Numbers</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
<th>Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAAS311Z</td>
<td>Hist Slavery West Hemisphere</td>
<td>7855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AANT319</td>
<td>Physical Growth/Development</td>
<td>9294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AANT341</td>
<td>Ethnology of Mesoamerica</td>
<td>1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AANT422</td>
<td>Advanced Phonology</td>
<td>6828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AART520A</td>
<td>Sculpture III</td>
<td>1297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AATM107</td>
<td>The Oceans</td>
<td>9231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AATM699</td>
<td>Research I</td>
<td>1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI0110</td>
<td>General Biology I</td>
<td>1508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI0120</td>
<td>Human Genetics</td>
<td>6235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI0131</td>
<td>Neurobiology</td>
<td>1542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHM121</td>
<td>General Chemistry II</td>
<td>1719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHM124</td>
<td>General Chemistry Laboratory I</td>
<td>1726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOM465</td>
<td>Studies Communication Theory</td>
<td>9102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOM697A</td>
<td>Guided Research Project</td>
<td>9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECO110</td>
<td>Prin Eco I: Microeconomics</td>
<td>6944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AENG226</td>
<td>Focus-Lit Theme, Form, or Mode</td>
<td>6533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AENG310</td>
<td>Read &amp; Interpret Eng Studies</td>
<td>7004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHIS101</td>
<td>Amer Political+Social Hist II</td>
<td>9208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJRL100</td>
<td>Found. Journ. &amp; Media Studies</td>
<td>7220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJRL385</td>
<td>Broadcast Journalism</td>
<td>6932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJST499</td>
<td>Topics in Judaic Studies</td>
<td>8837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAT106</td>
<td>Survey of Calculus</td>
<td>9395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAT413</td>
<td>Advanced Calculus I</td>
<td>2541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMUS218</td>
<td>Special Topics in Music</td>
<td>9006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APHI115Y</td>
<td>Moral Choices</td>
<td>9557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASOC575</td>
<td>Ethnicity and Race</td>
<td>8914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHR202</td>
<td>Prod Pract 2A</td>
<td>3484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWSS310</td>
<td>Intro to Feminist Pedagogy</td>
<td>3511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACC644</td>
<td>Taxation of Estates &amp; Trusts</td>
<td>3571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BITM513</td>
<td>Quantitative Analysis for Bus</td>
<td>6882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNSE696</td>
<td>Intro to Res Prob II</td>
<td>8179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY420</td>
<td>Child and Adolescent Developmt</td>
<td>3723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY530</td>
<td>Statistical Methods I</td>
<td>6612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY623</td>
<td>Adv Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>3738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERDG655</td>
<td>Emergent Literacy</td>
<td>9094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEP1610</td>
<td>AIDS Epidemiology</td>
<td>3943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSI550</td>
<td>Information Retrieval</td>
<td>6799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIST655</td>
<td>Rare Books</td>
<td>6796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRJ202</td>
<td>Intro to Law &amp; Crimnl Justice</td>
<td>7884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPAD663</td>
<td>Comparative Policy Systems</td>
<td>5853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPOS103</td>
<td>Political Theory</td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPOS525Q</td>
<td>Feminist Thought &amp; Public Poli</td>
<td>6109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSSW650</td>
<td>Field Instruction I</td>
<td>4594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 5.6 Assessment of Student Learning Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Unavailable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>The assessment plans comprehensively address each academic level (undergraduate, MS/MA, PhD) and major.</td>
<td>The plan addresses the levels and majors together, without making distinctions between them.</td>
<td>The plan neglects one or more levels or majors.</td>
<td>Not specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td>The assessments have clear, realistic guidelines, which include learning outcomes for specific courses and/or levels that align with corresponding mission statements. Assessments align with outcomes and include appropriate direct as well as indirect measures.*</td>
<td>The plan lists a combination of topics/courses and outcomes that are related to the mission. Assessments relate to topics and outcomes and include direct and indirect measures.</td>
<td>The plan does not clearly identify learning outcomes and include only limited direct or indirect measures.</td>
<td>Not addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>The plan identifies a variety of appropriate individuals or groups who are assigned responsibility for designing, administering, scoring and reporting assessment results</td>
<td>The burden of assessment is carried by one or a few faculty members</td>
<td>Assessment duties are assigned appropriately (e.g., to students)</td>
<td>Not specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetables</td>
<td>The administration, scoring and reporting of assessments is done</td>
<td>Timetables for the administration, scoring and reporting of assessments are established and followed.</td>
<td>Timetables are not specified.</td>
<td>Not specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>The administration, scoring and reporting of assessments are adequately supported by institutional resources.</td>
<td>Assessment happens in spite of inadequate investment.</td>
<td>Assessment is deficient because of inadequate investment.</td>
<td>Not addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical but useful</td>
<td>Assessments are feasible but detailed and valued enough by the faculty to be sustainable and useful.</td>
<td>Assessments are valued but challenging to implement.</td>
<td>Assessments are not feasible and not valued.</td>
<td>Not addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>Assessment results provide sufficient, convincing evidence of student achievement of institutional and program learning outcomes.</td>
<td>The assessment plan provides evidence of student achievement of some but not all outcomes.</td>
<td>The assessment plan presents evidence of student failure.</td>
<td>The assessment plan presents insufficient evidence of student achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Direct Assessment of Learning Outcomes* (Practitioner’s Guide to Program Review, p. 48)

- Student work in capstone courses
- Student portfolios
- ETS/GRE items
- Pre-test, post-test program exams
- Licensure exam items
- Performances and presentations
- Comprehensive examinations
Master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation **Indirect Assessment of Learning Outcomes**

A) Surveys of students in their graduating year/semester, including the Student Experience Survey administered by Institutional Research
B) Focus groups or interviews with undergraduate/graduate students
C) Alumni surveys
D) Alumni placements in graduate school/career (if stated as learning outcome)
E) Employer surveys
Chapter 6: Student Admissions and Retention

Overview

Evolving from its original status as a teacher’s college, the University at Albany is now a recognized research institution, one of the four university centers of the State University of New York system. In the Memorandum of Understanding II, the expressed goals of the institution are to develop a curriculum and environment that will be fitting of a selective institution, while at the same time attracting and maintaining a student body that continues to be among the most diverse within the SUNY system.

In the past decade, UAlbany has focused on both undergraduate and graduate recruitment, support, and retention issues, consistent with Mission Review and SUNY Central’s decisions regarding what a University Center should “look like.” Significant organizational realignments and initiatives have brought resources and ongoing self-examination.

While struggling through economically challenging times that will undoubtedly necessitate changes at the University, it is important that UAlbany recruitment efforts be well-targeted. In addition to the New York State and national economic crises and their effects on higher education, the University faces demographic changes that will affect undergraduate recruiting pools now and the pool of potential graduate students by the end of the next decade. By 2013, a significant decline in high school graduates is projected for both New York and the northeastern United States (Appendix 6.6).

The past decade has been one of positive change and advancement for UAlbany regarding recruitment, admissions and retention. In 2005, reorganization of various offices and services under the aegis of the newly created position of vice provost for Enrollment Management signaled UAlbany’s rethinking of the student experience with regard to recruitment, admission and retention issues. Enrollment Management has partnered with Institutional Research to produce studies and data for evaluating success of various admission strategies, graduation rates and retention programs. Another partner of Enrollment Management is UAlbany’s Office of Communications and Marketing. Technologies have been utilized in a more strategic and efficient way for admissions, advisement, student billing and payments, and other communications.

The University Mission statement is the basis for the goals and objectives of our enrollment plan. The 2008 enrollment plan calls for a gradual increase of the undergraduate enrollment from 2008 – 2010 by 1,100. The 2010 projected freshman class size is 2,400 and the transfer class size 1,550. However, given the various budget exigencies, both freshmen and transfer class sizes will each have 100 fewer students in 2009-2010. Graduate student enrollment numbers have remained constant at around 4,900; however as an enrollment percentage, they have decreased over the same period from 30% to 27%. (Appendix 6.1)
UAlbany has recognized the need to differentiate strategies for undergraduate students and graduate students. The first portion of this chapter addresses undergraduate students and the second portion addresses graduate students.

**UAlbany Undergraduates**

**Building the Applicant Pool and Admissions**

As a public institution within the State University of New York system, part of the University at Albany's mission is to meet the educational needs of the citizens of New York State. Thus, UAlbany's natural applicant pool for undergraduate students is New York, with 92% of its entering classes state residents (Appendix 6.3). UAlbany draws heavily from three regions in the state (Lower Hudson, New York City and Long Island) although all regions of the State are represented in each freshmen class (Appendix 6.2). The University is committed to having a student body that reflects the demographic composition of New York. Currently, UAlbany's student population includes 25% classified as African American, Asian American, Hispanic, and Native American. Appendix 6.10 indicates an increase in each category over the 2004-2008 period, with the exception of Native Americans.

States contiguous to New York and states in the Northeast are considered a secondary market for recruitment efforts. Travel distance to attend the University from these areas is within a day’s car or plane ride. The overwhelming majority of college bound students—over 90%—attend school within a six-hour travel time from their homes. Since 2005, recruitment efforts into contiguous states have intensified, as UAlbany has sought to increase geographic diversity. In addition, professional staff traveling out of state for recruitment purposes has increased from one full-time staff person plus occasional part-time assistance in 2000, to three to four full-time professional staff members along with continued part-time assistance in 2008. Applications from out of state have increased by 14.6% from 2007 to 2008, and 44.0% since 2004 (Appendix 6.7). Consequently, UAlbany has more out-of-state students; however, as the entire freshmen class has increased, out-of-state student enrollments have remained around the 7% mark (Appendix 6.3; Appendix 6.4). An obstacle to recruiting in contiguous states is perceived lack of knowledge about SUNY in general and UAlbany in particular, plus a cultural allegiance to New England as a region. In fact, much of UAlbany’s national geographical diversity comes from alumni who moved out of state and are now sending their children back to New York for school, i.e., people who already know about UAlbany from a generation ago. Another source of geographical diversity is athletics, because Division I institutions draw from a national pool of student-athletes.

Between 2004 and 2008, international undergraduate enrollment increased by approximately 1% (Appendix 6.5;). Applications from international sources increased 28.8% from 2007 to 2008, and 93.6% since 2004 (Appendix 6.8). Increases of international undergraduate student admissions and enrollments illustrate UAlbany’s positioning as articulated by its World within Reach branding, unveiled in 2008. “Diversity that Enriches Learning -- UAlbany is the ideal place to get a global perspective.” Students and faculty come from more than 100 countries, bringing different and fresh perspectives. This breadth of diversity adds rich texture to the
learning that takes place on campus and prepares UAlbany students to become world citizens in today’s interconnected global society” (http://www.albany.edu/news/release_2036.shtml). International travel for the purpose of recruiting students to UAlbany has also increased over the past five years, with sustained travel to China, Malaysia, Vietnam, Hong Kong, Korea, and India. A conditional admit program in conjunction with UAlbany’s Intensive English Language Program (IELP), Office of International Education, has been successful in adding to international student enrollment.

The authority for establishing the policies for undergraduate admission lies with the University Senate. Each fall, the designated enrollment officer is charged with reporting to the Committee on Admissions and Academic Standing of the Undergraduate Academic Council and describing the academic profile of the entering class, the ways in which admissions criteria were applied, and progress towards reaching enrollment goals. The Office of Undergraduate Admissions strives to admit a target number of students while also endeavoring to maintain and improve the University’s standard of excellence and the level of diversity within the student body. The admission decisions are therefore based on a holistic review of student records that includes high school records, standardized test scores, and non-academic components such as the involvement and quality of extracurricular activity, athletics, community service, leadership, disabilities, and geographic, cultural, racial and socioeconomic background.

The size and demographics of entering classes at UAlbany are proposed by Enrollment Management, and the plan is vetted by a number of stakeholders. Among the factors that come into play are classroom architecture, finances, and residential space. Based on revenue needs, available resources, and desired class demographic profiles, two numbers are proposed: the number of students to be admitted as freshmen, and the number of students to be admitted as transfers. Target numbers are advocated to the provost and are ultimately approved by the president.

Pre-application is the period during which the Office of Undergraduate Admissions tries to get the biggest and most diverse applicant pool possible, given the resources available to the office for travel and publicity. Initiatives to increase the racial diversity of the class begin with pre-application recruiting at particular kinds of high schools or in particular regions. This approach meshes well with the University’s mission to reach and serve all of the citizens of New York State, and to contribute to the welfare of the state as a whole through educating its citizens. Although UAlbany has limited advertising in venues such as Peterson’s Guide, admissions counselors travel to college fairs and high schools to build UAlbany’s name recognition and to speak with interested students. Admissions also purchases lists of student information based on PSAT and SAT scores and sends mailings to students who are appropriate for UAlbany standards. A large “Open House” on campus in the fall is targeted at students who have not yet chosen the schools to which they will apply. Tours of the campus take place all year round, and programs such as “Closer Look,” for students who have not had much exposure to the process of applying to college, as well as programs at local high schools, reach out to and bring onto campus students who make the University’s applicant pool resemble more closely New York's population.
SUNY has devised a selectivity matrix (Appendix 6.26) utilized at UAlbany. The Enrollment Management strategic plan in 2005 outlined the objectives of increasing SUNY Group 1 enrollments to 38% of the entering freshman class by 2010 from 26.6% in 2005. The SUNY Selectivity Matrix generates Groups based on combinations of SAT scores and GPA. Thus, a student with a SAT over 1300 and a GPA of 84.5 would be Group 1, as would a student with an SAT of 1100 and a GPA of 95.5. Group 1 has a subcategory of Presidential Scholars (the combination of high SATs and high GPAs) and Group 2 has subcategories of A, B, and C, with G2A having the highest score combinations. Almost all applicants falling into Groups 1 and 2 are admitted, while applicants falling into Groups 4 and 5 are generally denied admission unless they qualify under the EOP program. Group 3 applicants are considered for admission based on other factors that they might bring to the University, such as extracurricular activities or geographic diversity. The larger the applicant pool is, the higher the percentage of SUNY Group 1 students in the class. Less than half the students who apply are admitted. Two competing pressures in recruiting a class are selectivity and the need to enroll enough students to bring in the necessary dollars. Up until 2009, UAlbany had not progressed in increasing selectivity; however, it had not lost ground (Appendix 6.9). A challenge for the University in recruiting Group I students is the lack of certain programs, such as engineering, which attract higher performing students.

A strategy to increase selectivity is to highlight new offerings, including the Honors College and nanoengineering programs, and long-standing strong programs, such as psychology, social welfare and criminal justice, to cite a few examples. The class admitted for fall 2009 promises to be one of the most academically accomplished of the decade as students seek good value public universities and are passing up private higher education options in these economically challenging times.

Recruiting SUNY Group I students begins with UAlbany’s commitment to maintaining and increasing funds available for merit-based scholarships. Approximately 5% of the entering class each year receive such assistance. The merit scholarships, including Presidential Scholars and Frederick Douglass Scholarships (for underrepresented minority groups), are designed to recognize and help nurture outstanding students and offer participants the chance to study with other highly qualified high-achieving undergraduates. To be considered for these programs, students must first apply for admission to the University. Invitations are based on each applicant’s high school performances and combined SAT scores.

In September 2006, in order to further attract and retain the higher performing student, the University added an Honors College. As stated in a Memorandum of Understanding, November 2006:

*The University’s most impressive strategy for increasing the quality of its undergraduates has been the establishment and marketing of the Honors College, instituted in order to provide a highly rigorous undergraduate intellectual experience for the University’s most ambitious and talented students and to attract these students to the University from across the nation.*
When it reaches its planned initial capacity in 2010, the Honors College will have approximately 500 enrolled students. Eventually the program will graduate 150 students each year. The program continues to evolve, and there are still some challenges that it attempts to address by tweaking different elements (e.g., how many students should be admitted as part of the incoming freshman class versus those admitted at the end of freshman year). The Honors College appears to be of great value for both recruiting more SUNY Group I students and raising the quality of the educational experience overall. This program should be assessed and reviewed regarding its contributions and role, and have its enrollment targets reviewed for the next five to ten years.

One of the most successful special admit programs at the University is the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), which admits approximately 145 students each year. EOP prepares students before they start college, monitors their progress, and provides support services in academic, financial and social areas. The program accepts students with proven financial and academic deficiencies who have been identified as having potential, ability and determination to be successful in an academic environment. Admission to EOP is based on high school performance, recommendations, and a formal assessment of financial eligibility according to legislated guidelines. Transfer students are eligible for EOP admission only if they have been enrolled previously in an EOP, HEOP, College Discovery, SEEK, or EOP-type program elsewhere and meet all other transfer requirements.

The Admissions office works in partnership with the Disability Resource Center (DRC), which provides services for students with disabilities who need supplemental support to be successful. The DRC is also involved in every open house that is hosted for prospective and admitted students. In addition, the DRC sends personal letters to students who have identified themselves as having disabilities, informing them of the services offered and getting incoming students into the network of services.

Athletics is another area that works collaboratively with enrollment management in the Office for Undergraduate Admission to ensure that recruiting efforts for athletes are in concert with University and NCAA standards. An admissions counselor familiar with college athletics and NCAA recruiting rules and regulations is assigned to inspect all applications from recruited athletes and to work with the coaches and other Athletics department officials to ensure that standards are maintained regarding academic and other admissions standards, and recruitment.

November 1 is the deadline for early action. Early action applicants do not make up a significant part of the applicant pool, usually numbering no more than 2,000 out of approximately 24,000 applicants. The deadline for regular applications is March 1; however, if a class is not full, Admissions may continue to read applications into April. Usually, applicant files are complete (with scores, school transcripts, letters of recommendation) from the beginning of March, and letters of acceptance begin going out at the end of January. Acceptances are sent first, and denial letters go out at the end of February. The deposit deadline is May 1.

1 http://www.albany.edu/honorscollege/FirstYearReport.shtml
Each year the University must grapple with uncertainty concerning the yield of students admitted. The yield has implications for services such as housing and advising. When the yield is greater than expected, as was the case in 2005, 2006, and 2009, actions must be taken to accommodate the extra students, so that student satisfaction and other operations are not negatively affected.

The Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness (IRPE) collects and interprets data about the changing group characteristics of applicants, as well as admitted and matriculating students. The University has access to data on the demography of each entering class and its rate of retention and graduation. Any policies that are enacted – such as programs to increase the retention rates of transfer students or programs that create smaller cohort groups within the first-year class (such as Project Renaissance or EOP) – can be evaluated based on these data.

Post-acceptance recruiting includes an Open House for accepted students in the spring, as well as regional receptions for accepted students who do not live near campus. Accepted students are also sent targeted mailings and emails about specific programs that would be available to them should they matriculate at UAlbany. All accepted students get a call from a tele-counselor who is a current student at the University. Presidential Scholars are called by faculty, and prospective students living outside of New York State are called by alumni.

In the past decade, UAlbany has implemented PeopleSoft and utilizes functions both in PeopleSoft and Nolij to manage admissions applications. Applications materials are online and sent in digital format. Applications arriving as hard copy, are scanned and put in the applicant’s digital file. Scanned application materials are subsequently shredded. There are no longer physical files; which used to be kept for three years; since electronic files take up less room and access is more controllable, they may be kept indefinitely. Counselors access the files through password-protected security systems. Although access to student information is provided to a number of people to do effective admissions and recruitment, the log-in requirement provides an additional measure of accountability to ensure that information is restricted to employees with authorized access. In addition to the prevention against unauthorized entry built into any University database, PeopleSoft and Nolij provide further levels of security.

With projections of a diminished high school applicant pool in New York State, UAlbany will likely continue efforts to expand recruitment nationally and internationally (Appendix 6.6). Brand name recognition is 50% of why a student will approach a counselor at a college fair or why a high school counselor will recommend that a student research a particular school. Regional and national advertising is needed to increase name recognition and to make UAlbany’s benefits more well-known. If UAlbany is to reach its goal of raising its national profile by admitting more SUNY Group 1 students, it must continue to increase both its applicant pool and the yield of admitted students.

With regard to the Processes of Admissions, UAlbany should develop a regular procedure for assessing and reviewing the security measures that keep applicant data private. The University should also review and assess whether the University’s early action and other admissions deadlines serve our admissions goals.
With regard to building the undergraduate applicant pool, the University should increase the likelihood that higher performing students (considered “SUNY Group I students”) will apply, matriculate and remain at the University by increasing the funds available for the University Scholars Programs, including financial awards to Presidential and Frederick Douglass scholars. The University should also assess and review the Honors College for its contribution both to University recruitment of SUNY Group I students and overall contribution to campus life. Enrollment targets should be set for this program for the next 5-10 years, should the assessment be positive.

Transfer Students

In recent years, transfer students accounted for an increasing percentage of UAlbany’s class composition, with the majority coming from SUNY community colleges (See Appendices 6.13, 6.14, 6.15). UAlbany’s office of Transfer Experience Coordinator monitors agreements with New York’s community colleges and negotiates updated agreements. Because the grade point average required for admission as a transfer student is 2.5, it has been easier to get into UAlbany as a transfer student than as a freshman (with the exception of admissions to the majors in Business, Criminal Justice, Social Welfare and Public Health). Moreover, although the GPA was set at the minimum of 2.5, in the past, students with lower GPAs have been admitted. The GPA criterion is now strictly enforced.

The Undergraduate Admissions Website for transfer applicants outlines the guidelines and practices of credit transfer and provides a database of courses transferred over time to UAlbany by students from other institutions. Once admitted, students receive an estimated number of qualified academic transfer credits in their acceptance letter. This estimate assists a transfer student in determining whether a decision to attend UAlbany is in their best interest in terms of time to degree completion. Once a transfer student has paid his or her enrollment deposit, a transfer credit evaluation and degree audit is created using the Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS) software. All rules associated with completion of a UAlbany undergraduate degree are programmed into DARS. A road map, it displays the courses that can be selected in order to complete degree requirements and shows how courses already taken apply toward those requirements. Transfer students and their advisors consult the audit during transfer planning conferences and throughout the student’s UAlbany career. Anecdotally, some faculty have expressed the opinion that this process does not serve international students well because many staff are not familiar with the institutions the students have come from. The evaluation of transfer credit from foreign institutions is often problematic, and, insofar as it leads to poor advisement, retention and graduation rates are affected. It is recommended that the University develop standardized ways to evaluate transfer credits for international students. This may involve research into international rankings and specific teaching methods, programs, and courses. Objective, documentable sources should be emphasized.

One-day orientation sessions are offered to transfer students and their parents. In prior years, students’ interactions with their advisors at orientation focused mainly on registering, rather than on discussing a more comprehensive education plan, which potentially could include such topics as honors programs, internships, and study abroad opportunities (from Retention Committee report, page 30). Having identified this challenge, the Academic Services Center piloted a
program with seven departments in summer 2008. Transfer students worked through an online site designed to assist them in reading their transfer evaluation report and DARS. Each department also wrote up general advice for incoming transfer majors. Using these tools, transfer students prepared a plan for fall course registration and submitted the plan electronically to their advisors. Advisors and students communicated individually until both agreed that the plan was appropriate. Students were then able to register for courses from home. This allowed them to spend time with advisors during Orientation, talking about academic career goals rather than merely scheduling classes for the upcoming semester. Feedback from the Advisement Services Center indicates 60% (327) of the applicable students in the pilot used the new system. Several of the departments have embraced this new approach completely, requiring all new transfers to get registered in this fashion. Other departments have continued to provide advisement and registration at Orientation as well as through the online pilot. Three additional departments were added to the pilot in spring 2009. Technological enhancements will allow other departments to begin participating during summer 2009.

As part of the Selective Investment process for 2006-2007, the Office of Undergraduate Education received funds to hire a transfer experience coordinator, charged with working with various offices on campus to develop programming that aids transfer students' assimilation on campus, both academically and socially. The coordinator provided programming support and in 2007 established a campus chapter of Tau Sigma, the national honor society specifically for transfer students. In the 2008-2009, a lounge for transfer and commuter students was established in the Campus Center.

Given the discussion above, it is recommended that the University assess the procedures for evaluating transfer credits for international students, and develop standardized procedures as needed.

Financial Aid

The Student Financial Center administers federal, state, and certain institutional student financial assistance programs for undergraduate and graduate students. In addition to overall college financing and financial aid advisement, the office manages a variety of funds, including the Federal Stafford and other federal and state loan programs. It also coordinates the Emergency Loan Fund. All applicants who file a Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) are offered at least a $5,500 student loan if sufficient financial need exists. Students may qualify for additional grants, loans or work-study, based on their financial situation and availability of funds.

Of the 13,248 undergraduate students enrolled for fall 2008 at UAlbany, 83% were offered some type of financial assistance, including grants and scholarships; 78% applied for need-based financial aid (percentages of students offered financial awards for 2008-09 are in Appendix 6.16). Of the FAFSA filers, 43% have family incomes of less than $50,000; 23% were awarded Perkins Loan, Federal Work-Study and/or Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (FSEOG). FSEOG funds are specifically offered to those with a zero family contribution until funds are exhausted.; this funding is limited and insufficient in terms of reaching all UAlbany students with a zero family contribution. Moreover, 39% of FAFSA filers receive Pell Grants. This represented approximately 30% of the total undergraduate population for fall 2008. The Pell Grant is the largest federal grant program targeting needy students. Finally, 45% of students who
file for FAFSA receive at least the minimum in New York State Tuition Assistance Program (TAP) aid. Concerns have been expressed that students are taking off-campus jobs to fill the aid gap, thus affecting on-time graduation, retention rates, and individual grade point averages.

Admitted students with valid FAFSA data are notified in March of their financial aid awards. Returning students are emailed so that they may view/accept/decline their financial aid awards on MyUAlbany, beginning in June for the following fall semester. Students can access additional information on the Student Financial Services Website, or may call or visit the Student Services Center for individualized counseling. In addition, group sessions are held in conjunction with new student orientations. New federal loan borrowers are required to complete loan entrance counseling; they are taken through a series of online data and questions in order to allow their loans to disburse.

Insofar as possible, UAlbany should continue to support and develop initiatives to decrease the amount of unmet need (totaling $27,000,000 for 2007-2008) to allow students to spend more time on the campus and less time working at part-time jobs.

**Undergraduate Retention**

Higher retention and graduation rates are directly related to the University’s mission. Higher retention rates provide prospective students with a greater likelihood of success and therefore greater educational value. This then increases the number of satisfied and productive alumni. Higher graduation rates reflect lower costs to students in earning their degrees, as well as more efficient use of University and state educational resources.

Retention rates are measured by the percentage of a cohort that continues enrollment or graduates by a certain future semester. For example, of the freshman cohort entering fall2003, 73.5% were still enrolled in the fifth semester (Appendix I, University Retention Committee Report, 2006-2007). UAlbany retention rates compare favorably with those of other institutions: for the first-time freshman cohort of 2002, the retention rate from first to second year was 83.7%, compared to 79.40% for selective institutions and 88.20% for highly selective institutions.\(^2\)

Graduation rates are measured by the percentage of a cohort that has graduated by the fourth, fifth or sixth year. A cohort in a particular year consists of full-time, first-time bachelor (or equivalent) degree-seeking students who entered in the summer or fall of that year. The graduation rates for the University are generated from IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems). For the 2001 cohort, the University had a six-year graduation rate of 64%, compared to an average of 61% for its ten current peer institutions. The six-year graduation rate for the University’s eight aspirational peers was 74%. In comparing data from different populations, it is usually necessary to control for relevant differences in the populations. In comparing retention and graduation rates with peer institutions, it would therefore be useful to analyze whether differences in student populations account for some of the variation. For example, a higher percentage of UAlbany students (29%) receive Pell Grants than our peer

\(^2\)Office of Enrollment Management presentation October 31, 2008; Consortium of Student Retention Data Exchange at colIgereSULits.org
institutions. Nonetheless, UAlbany must continue its commitment to raising its retention and graduation rates.

Despite these generally positive comparisons with peer institutions, the University determined that more progress was needed to match results for highly selective institutions and improve first-year retention rates by 1% per year (SUNY Mission Review MOU; Retention Report 2006-2007, Introduction, page 3). The importance of retention for the University and its students prompted the University in 2005 to commission a Retention Committee with participation by faculty, staff and students. Data considered by the committee included retention and graduation rates for students in different categories, such as Presidential Scholar, College Scholar, Project Renaissance, traditional, consideration, EOP and international. For fall 2000 and 2001 entering full-time freshman, rates are further differentiated by demographic category (male and female; and African American, Asian, Hispanic, white and other). Consideration of these data led to formulation of eight measurable objectives and corresponding action plans (Appendix 6.27).

The Retention Committee has also investigated and continues to investigate academic reasons for student attrition by examining gateway course outcomes across departments and by examining differential graduation rates by department. These data have been made available to department directors of undergraduate studies for self-study, analysis, and policy change.

A special study on why students did not return for the fall 2007 semester was collected for the Retention Committee from responses that non-returning students provided when they withdrew. These responses could be divided according to whether students had a cumulative grade point average greater than 2.0 and whether they were known to have transferred elsewhere. Data were also available on where they transferred to, if known. The data are not entirely inclusive since students leave without formally withdrawing and thus their reasons for departing UAlbany are not known.

The Retention Committee operated by identifying a programmatic or administrative segment of the University relevant to student retention, and then invited responsible individuals to discuss issues with the committee. The invitation induced the unit to prepare a report on its operations, and propose revisions. These procedures facilitated productive interactions with stakeholders throughout the University. This model appears to provide an effective method of bringing about change at the institution.

Retention depends substantially on whether or not incoming students are prepared for the academic, administrative and social aspects of their lives at the University at Albany. The Office of Academic Support Services, as the name implies, provides students with academic services as needed (these services are described in Chapter 7). The data on retention indicate that retention is related to participation in different programs (for example, Project Renaissance and freshman or University one-credit seminars). The Retention Committee reviewed freshman year experiences to identify ways to enhance orientation and first-semester experiences, and to contribute to academic success. Among the outcomes of this review were creation of a University Seminar for incoming students (UFSP 101, approved by the Undergraduate Academic Council in May 2007) and a Freshman Focus program for the second semester. Questions later raised by the University Senate about how the content of UFSP 101 courses was determined and how the instructional
staff was chosen, have led to a suspension of these courses and the creation of a Freshman Year Experience Task Force. The report of this task force was issued in fall 2009 and will be the subject of discussion during the 2009-2010 academic year.

The most important program to support at-risk students is EOP. It has been highly successful in generating high retention rates among students who would otherwise be at risk. For example, the retention rate for EOP students not in Project Renaissance was 98.2% from the second to the third semester compared to 92.8% of traditionally admitted, non-EOP students not President or College scholars (Appendix 6.17).

The University Retention Committee has been especially concerned with retention rates of male students of color. The Office of Multicultural Affairs, together with a number of other groups on campus, has sought to generate mentoring and fellowship opportunities. In 2008-2009, there was a modest increase in the number of African and Latino heritage male recipients of the Spellman Achievement Awards for leadership and community service; these annual awards recognize African American, Latino, Asian American, and Native American students at the University for their efforts to enhance campus and community life. The increase may be due to increased self-reported ethnicity, although might also reflect better support for this population. The University should explore best ways to encourage students to self-report their ethnicity to enhance the accuracy of institutional data.

Some faculty members expressed to committee members that, at time, they would like to refer students perceived to be having academic, social, financial and other difficulties affecting academic performance to appropriate campus offices and resources for support. However, these same faculty members say it is often unclear what resources are available.

To overcome this problem, the University should support the Retention Committee’s initiatives to collect further data on the reasons behind student attrition, with a particular focus on possible race, gender, and ethnic identity-driven factors, and investigate better ways to encourage students to self-report their ethnicity. This will enhance the accuracy of UAlbany’s data. Further, the University should distribute annually to faculty a single sheet or provide a Website with clear instructions and contact information regarding available support services, where to refer students and whom to notify when students are in trouble or have disappeared from class. Funding for Academic Support Services’ initiatives such as the implementation of an academic help desk and the appointment of a freshman-year coordinator, should be increased. Current policy of not awarding merit-based scholarships to students who have matriculated should be reviewed.

**Academic Advisement**

Advisement services are strongly related to retention; by providing students with appropriate course plans, they increase student success in meeting academic goals. Both advising and mentoring within the major and before the major is declared are vital to student retention. The Advisement Services Center has revised practices substantially both for incoming freshmen and transfer students by devising MAPS, which are route plans for each major. The work of the Advisement Task Force four years ago led to a University Senate-approved policy placing the
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3 The Report of the Retention Committee is available in the Self-Study Document Inventory.
responsibility for upper-level advising with the academic departments. The process, experience and effectiveness of upper-level advising vary widely from department to department. To date, there has been no systematic assessment of the effectiveness of the varying approaches to upper-level advising.

Students may access their DARS degree-audit reports through MyUAlbany. However, anecdotally, some faculty say that the current format is not user-friendly, leaving many students unaware of what they need to graduate. Cited challenges to the DARS reports include: procedures regarding grade point averages; courses taken out of sequence; graduation requirements not met for the program or major; and General Education requirements not met.

Another factor that contributes to inadequate course-planning by students is the inability of the course registration computer systems to enforce prerequisites. This clearly can affect both time taken to graduate and retention. The adequacy of advisement in the minor is also a matter of particular concern because responsibility for such advisement currently rests with the department in which students are majoring; staff providing advisement in one department may not be familiar with the requirements and course offerings in others. Proposals for the elimination of the mandatory minor have been submitted in the past but have not been approved by governance.

The University should review and assess, perhaps under the auspices of the Retention Committee, upper-level advising practices across the University, to identify the most successful strategies. The University should also review and assess the degree to which DARS is effective, and how it might be made more so. Finally, UAlbany should renew consideration of the elimination of the mandatory undergraduate minor.

Economics and Retention

While the University supports some students through merit scholarships, for many students adequate financial aid is an important factor in timely graduation. The University meets the financial needs of its students through various federal, state and campus-based programs. However, UAlbany students have a relatively high level of financial need; for instance, a higher percentage (29%) of UAlbany undergraduates receive Pell Grants as a result of family incomes below $50,000 than students at 10 peer institutions (Appendix 6.11). Consequently, there are likely to be unmet financial needs that generate delays in graduation for some students – for example, by requiring them to work longer hours while attending the University.

Over the longer term, because of current economic conditions and reduced assets among families sending students to college, the University can expect an increased number of applicants who otherwise would have applied to private institutions. For individuals like these, the University must afford a combination of low cost and academic quality. In addition, many individuals with reduced support from families will need employment to support themselves while attending UAlbany. The University should take steps to accommodate them by assisting in job searches and placements, providing flexibility in scheduling classes, and adapting to employment demands upon students.

GRADUATE ADMISSION, RETENTION, SUPPORT AND PROGRAM STRENGTHENING

Graduate student funding and program strength are critical factors in attracting, retaining and placing graduate students. Over the next decade, building UAlbany’s reputation and reaping the benefits that strong graduate programs deliver will depend on the institution’s ability to support individual students in their time at the University, and the campus’s ability to keep its programs and departments nationally competitive. These issues are discussed in more detail below.

Graduate Admissions

The number of graduate students has remained more or less the same since 2000; as planned, increased undergraduate enrollment has changed the percentage of graduate students overall from 30% in fall 2003 to 27% in fall 2008 (Appendix 6.1). The conscious realignment in the percentage of graduate students was outlined in the SUNY Memorandum of Understanding II (page 4). Even at 27%, UAlbany's graduate population exceeds the norm for public research universities.

Graduate Admissions provides general recruitment and public contact services for graduate constituents and, under the auspices of the dean of Graduate Studies, assures that decisions of departmental review committees are in compliance with graduate academic and admissions policies. Graduate Admissions also acts as a central authority for receipt of applications, fees, test scores and other required supporting documents. In 2005, the Office of Graduate Admissions became part of enrollment management within Academic Affairs.

Unlike the undergraduate admissions process, admission to UAlbany graduate programs is decentralized. Each graduate program has its own admissions committee, with 40 to 45 graduate admissions committees operating across the academic departments. Some departments have separate master’s and doctoral admitting committees, composed of entirely different faculty. The University Senate’s Graduate Academic Council and its Committee on Admissions and Academic Standing establishes criteria for determining academic standing and admissions policy, reviews academic grievances, and oversees any exceptions to admissions policies. Formal graduate admission application requirements are included within each program’s registration by the New York State Education Department. After approval, admissions standards are added to UAlbany’s Inventory of Registered Programs. General guidelines and requirements for admission are published in the University’s Graduate Bulletin. The Office of Graduate Admissions also maintains an internal control document that records the most current admissions requirements and standards.

Graduate students are expected to hold a bachelor's degree from a college or university of recognized standing; international students must have a four-year degree. Their preparation must be appropriate to the program they wish to pursue and they should generally have maintained a B
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average or better in course work that the department considers preparatory for graduate study. The University supports diversity of student backgrounds and points of view; to meet that goal, admissions committees may consider relevant characteristics brought to their attention by the applicant or his or her references.

In 2006, the dean of Graduate Studies, in collaboration with departmental graduate admissions committees, initiated inquiries into how admissions policies might affect later retention rates. Alterations of policy as a result of this initiative have included such changes as new minimum “Test of English as a Foreign Language” (TOEFL) standards.

**Graduate Funding**

The University’s Office of Student Financial Services administers a variety of federal, state and private aid financial aid programs on a calculated need basis. Graduate aid is most typically offered via federal loan programs. Eligible students must file the FAFSA, have been admitted to, or matriculated in a degree program, and enroll at least half-time (6 credits per term).

Graduate student funding is a mix of funding allocated from SUNY Administration and internal funds from the UAlbany campus (Appendix 6.19). Academically competitive, merit-based awards are available in many graduate programs at the University, particularly though not exclusively for doctoral students, and are typically designed to support students engaged in full-time pursuit of the graduate degree. Funded assistantships provide program-related practical teaching, research, or administrative experience. Fellowships provide a stipend without service requirements to allow for the graduate student to be exclusively engaged in his/her academic work in a way that shortens time to degree completion. Tuition Scholarship Awards are applied towards University tuition costs. Most assistantship, fellowship and tuition scholarship awards are administered directly in the University’s schools and colleges.

Several funding programs are in place to support diversity in the graduate student population. Awards are centrally managed by the Office of Graduate Studies. “The Graduate Tuition Opportunity Program is funded by a special appropriation from the State University of New York, coupled with significant funding from the University at Albany. GTOP provides full tuition scholarship support to former EOP, HEOP program graduates”7 (Appendix 6.21). UAlbany offers competitive, merit-based Carson Carr Graduate Diversity Scholar awards, designed to foster a diverse graduate student body by recruiting, enrolling, and retaining students in doctoral and master’s degree programs who meet eligibility criteria. Diversity scholars teach and/or assist with a faculty member’s research over the course of their graduate program (Appendix 6.20).

UAlbany is a participant in SUNY’s Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (AGEP) program, an NSF-funded alliance of the four doctoral degree-granting state universities in New York: Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo and Stony Brook. AGEP’s mission is to transform graduate education into a more accessible to and inclusive experience for underrepresented students and faculty in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). Immediate objectives are to increase the number of underrepresented minority students pursuing doctoral
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studies in these fields, enrich their academic experience, promote their success, and ensure their access to services that will assist their achievement. Services for students include: mentoring by the AGEP program staff; the Summer Research Institute for undergraduates; Summer Head-Start for incoming graduate students; travel to professional conferences; financial incentives; and faculty mentoring (Appendices 6.22 and 6.23). The conference, “Preparing for the Professoriate,” has been held annually since 2003 (Appendix 6.24).

With the decentralized nature of graduate admissions, mixed funding sources and various types of diversity-targeted funding programs; the importance of the role of the 40-45 graduate admissions committees cannot be understated; they are critical to the process of informing prospective graduate students of University resources which are directly related to enhancing campus diversity, and which could assist students in funding their graduate education.

**Initiatives to Increase Graduate Support and Program Strengths**

Over the course of the self-study period, UAlbany has struggled to maintain appropriate levels of graduate student support. As Appendix 6.19 shows, the University graduate student support budget was approximately 13.6 million at the beginning of the decade. By 2008-09, that budget was approximately $14.1 million. While graduate student funding has been relatively flat over this period, this situation arose despite several campus initiatives to ameliorate the effects of state funding cuts and tuition increases. A program of Presidential Fellows was supported at half a million dollars. Departments nominated students based on GRE scores. Students received a fellowship and full tuition at $17,000. However, this became less than what students would have received at peer institutions, and, in the last year of the program, 14 offers netted but three acceptances. Indeed, the MSCHE 2000 review team recommended that “The University should provide substantial enhancement to the graduate student support budget.” In the 2005 Periodic Review Report, it was noted that gains made in the early part of the decade “have been eroded due to reductions in State support and legislatively determined tuition increases in 2003 that were not accompanied by increased funds for graduate tuition scholarships.” UAlbany contributed to an increase mid-decade to bring total monies to $14.1 million (Appendix 6.19).

In 2006, the dean of Graduate Studies initiated several programs targeted at graduate admissions, that would improve the strength of entering cohorts, retention, and rates of completion. Monies were redirected to provide broader support for admitted graduate students and also to enhance departments’ ability to recruit strong candidates. These initiatives included stipend increases and the use of the “risk/probability factor” to predict how many offers will be accepted; this allows departments to make offers to candidates earlier, rather than waiting and taking the risk that prospective students will have accepted offers at other programs. This increases the quality of students accepted overall. Operating with the risk/probability factor, some departments know that 50% of their offers will be accepted; thus, they now extend offers to twice as many prospective students. By 2008-09, initiatives begun in 2006 had resulted in an allocation of $14.1 million to attract and retain graduate students; $1.5 million of this total was directed to diversity initiatives. Some faculty have expressed concern that the “risk/probability” model might result in large enrollment swings from year to year, but there is insufficient evidence to date to evaluate this concern.
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Graduate student stipends are vital to the programs, as indicated by responses to a Graduate Student Assessment Survey (March-April 2008) question about the “financial support offer.” Of doctoral students, 48% responded it was “extremely important,” and another 28% said it was “very important,” while 23% of Master’s students said it was “extremely important” and 23% said “very important.” The average full-time graduate assistant or teaching assistant stipend had only risen from $9,854 in 2000-01 to $10,076 in 2004-05. The average full-time doctoral stipend for 2008-2009 was $12,895.

The most important factor for graduate student success is number or length of years that institutional financial support is available to students. Ph.D. students are usually supported for four years. As of 2008-09, doctoral students who have advanced to candidacy can receive a fifth a year of funding.

The Dissertation Research Fellowship Award Fund was supported by UAlbany’s Selective Investment program with $50,000 in 2006-2007 and again in 2007-2008. Due to financial exigencies, the program was suspended in 2008-2009, but was reinstated in 2009-10, accepting applications in June 2009. The dissertation research program is for students who have advanced to candidacy and need money to fund their research. Eligible students receiving these $1,000 awards are required to file a report on fund utilization. These funds are seen as key to doctoral research. The University is funding fewer incoming doctoral students during the current recession, but has continued and maintained funding of all previously funded students at prior levels.

**Current Funding Issues**

In 2009, the University reduced first-year graduate student funding in response to the economic crisis. An overall algorithm was established to determine school and college total allocations. This algorithm included an initial minimum allocation, which contained a 75% reduction for professional masters programs. For doctoral programs, the algorithm included a reduction based on program strength. Decisions were arrived at using four "quality indicators:" the average GRE scores of entering students for the past three to four years; third-year retention rate (an indication of whether graduate students are taking their departmental examinations on time); median time to degree; and three-year average of faculty productivity. Deans were able to make internal reallocations consistent with school/college doctoral priorities and needs. Ultimately, all programs were able to make at least one offer of funding to new students. Funding for all continuing eligible students was not affected by this budgetary reduction. A full-scale internal doctoral program review is currently underway.

Some faculty have suggested that the “quality indicators” should include job placement rates. Others have been critical of the use of Academic Analytics as a measure of departmental strength. Some feel that the idea of using “retention rates” can be deceptive, because higher retention rates may result from different timing of the administration of departmental comprehensive examinations (first vs. third year, for instance) or other discipline-specific differences. Another factor may be the “transfer out” of highly talented students to more highly-ranked programs elsewhere. Certainly it is difficult to compare what retention means across different disciplines, and, rather than allow individual departments to point to vague possibilities,
the internal doctoral program review must address these possibilities quantifiably by, for instance, getting statistics by individual departments on rates of transfers out and where they go. We emphasize that these are potentially contentious matters that can produce serious divisions within the University.

**Other Supports and Services Available to Graduate Students**

A number of non-monetary supports and services are available to graduate students. The Brown Bag Speaker series, organized by the Office of Graduate Studies, arranges lunch workshops three to four times per semester, with “success” measured by attendance. Social events and welcome events are also offered, although they are more difficult to assess. UAlbany’s Graduate Student Organization (GSO) is funded by graduate student activity fees and supports more than 40 registered graduate student groups. However, the Graduate Student Assessment Survey administered to master’s and Ph.D. students in March-April 2008 shows that nearly 62% of UAlbany master’s students and 46% of doctoral students had never used GSO services.

Two other resources available to graduate students are Career Services and UAlbany’s Institute for Teaching, Learning & Academic Leadership (ITLAL). Career Services often works in conjunction with placement officers in programs, such as social welfare, and also participates in T. A. departmental orientations. ITLAL supports graduate students teaching at UAlbany, as well as those planning on careers as faculty members, by offering an orientation to teaching roles at the beginning of the academic year. ITLAL provides a robust selection of workshops throughout the year that are especially designed for teaching assistants. It sends out regular *Teaching at Albany* mailings, sponsors a Teaching Portfolio Award for graduate students, and provides individual consultations to prepare T.A.s for the academic job market, and also hosts an annual symposium on graduate student teaching. It also offers an internal Certificate in College Teaching, which comprises course work, workshops and other experiences for interested students in terminal degree programs that prepares them for tenure-track positions in academe.

The Graduate Student Assessment Survey (March-April 2008) indicates that 96% of master’s students and 81% of doctoral students who responded to the survey never used ITLAL’s services; 80% of master’s students and 90% of doctoral students who responded to the survey never used the Career Development Center’s services. These figures are disappointing and suggest that the University might consider mechanisms for increasing awareness of the respective services.

A further mechanism to support graduate teaching assistants at UAlbany is the practice of reserving two of the five annual campus-level presidential awards for teaching excellence for the purpose of recognizing their contributions.

Progress has been made on two initiatives identified in 2005 (page 7 of “Campus Response to the 2005 External Review Reports, dated September 5, 2005): a graduate student exit survey and the utilization of PeopleSoft to assess achievement of student milestones. In March-April 2008, Institutional Research conducted the Graduate Assessment Survey. UAlbany upgraded its PeopleSoft system in 2008 and version 9.0 now provides the capacity to determine milestone information. This project is underway.
With regard to graduate programs, it is recommended that the University continue policies initiated in 2006 by the dean of Graduate Studies to make UAlbany graduate student support competitive with peer institutions and to allow departments (based on the risk/probability factor, discussed above) to extend more offers to prospective students earlier. The University should increase the amount of stipends, assure fifth year funding for students making satisfactory progress toward the degree, and increase the amount of fellowship aid. The University should also track the levels of diversity in graduate study overall and in individual departments with regard to minority categories, using the various funding programs available and administered by the Office of Graduate Studies; it should also establish reasonable baseline goals for diversity. Directors of Graduate Study and others involved in recruitment in individual departments should become aware of all available funding, understand the appropriate definitions of diversity categories, and work with departments whose numbers are significantly lower than the University’s targets to help strategize on recruitment and advertising.

The use of “non-financial” sources of graduate support and professionalization, beginning with Career Services and ITLAL, should continue to be fostered, but also include other GSO services. Individual departments should be aware of and actively encourage their graduate students to take advantage of professional development opportunities, such things as workshops offered by Career Services and ITLAL programs focusing on online course enhancement, the teaching of writing, classroom lecturing, and managing student discussions, as well as practical tutorials, such as on how to use Excel to build a gradebook. Directors of graduate studies within departments should be encouraged, particularly in departments that do not have their own teacher training program, to work with ITLAL to have graduate cohorts in particular disciplines attend trainings together. The University should actively foster collaboration between departments and Career Services. Finally, the University should actively work to ensure that differential cuts to graduate funding across departments as a result of the economic crisis are managed in a way that does not provoke permanent divisions among departments and faculty.

The importance of open and fair discussion cannot be overstated, the perception that all departments have equal access to their respective Dean’s ear, and serious investigation of all challenges to the criteria for measuring the strength of programs. Informed discussion concerning quality indicators and their measures must be an integral part of the doctoral program review, with an eye to discipline-specific parameters as accepted by the national associations for each field. Departments should be measured against disciplinary peers; when a department loses graduate lines it should receive support, including funded initiatives, to help it regain strength, as it aligns its practices with standards in the discipline.
APPENDICES

Appendix 6.1 Summary of Recommendations

UAlbany Undergraduates

With regard to building the undergraduate applicant pool:

- Increase the likelihood that the higher performing students considered “SUNY Group I students” will apply, matriculate and remain at the University by increasing the funds available for University scholars programs, including financial awards to Presidential Scholars and Frederick Douglass Scholars.

- Assess and review the Honors College, added in September 2006, for its contributions to University recruitment of SUNY Group I students and campus life; should this assessment be positive, set enrollment targets for this program for the next 5-10 years.

- Emphasize the combination of affordability and quality education that UAlbany offers to attract individuals who would have applied to private institutions under different economic circumstances.

With regard to international transfer students:

- Assess the procedures for evaluating transfer credits for international students, and develop standardized procedures as needed.

With regard to financial aid:

- Insofar as possible, continue to support and develop initiatives to decrease the amount of un-met need (totaling $27 million for 2007-2008) to allow UAlbany students to spend more time on campus and less time at part-time jobs.

With regard to retention:

- Support Retention Committee initiatives to collect further data on causes of student attrition and on possible race, gender, and ethnic identity-driven reasons for failure to graduate.

- Investigate how to encourage students to self-report their ethnicity, in order to enhance accuracy of UAlbany data.

- Distribute annually to faculty a single sheet or provide a Website with clear instructions and contact information regarding available support services, where to refer students, and who to notify when students are in trouble or are not attending class.
• Increase funding for Academic Support Services’ initiatives, such as the implementation of an academic help desk, a freshman-year coordinator.

• Review the policy of not awarding merit-based scholarships to students who have already matriculated.

• Take steps to accommodate those students who need to work to support themselves while attending UAlbany by assisting with job search and placement, providing flexibility in scheduling classes, and adapting to employment demands on students.

With respect to academic advisement:

• Review and assess, perhaps under the auspices of the Retention Committee, upper-level advising practices across the University; replicate the most successful strategies.

• Review and assess the degree to which DARS is effective and might be made more so.

• Renew consideration of the elimination of the mandatory undergraduate minor.

UAlbany Graduate Students

With regard to graduate programs:

• Continue policies initiated in 2006 by the dean of Graduate Studies to make graduate student support competitive with peer institutions and to allow departments (based on the risk/probability factor discussed below) to extend more offers to prospective students earlier.

• Increase the amount of stipends; assure fifth-year funding for students making satisfactory progress towards the degree; and increase the amount of aid delivered as fellowship aid.

• Track the levels of diversity in graduate study overall and in individual departments with regard to minority categories using the various funding programs available at the University and administered by the Office of Graduate Studies. Establish reasonable baseline goals for diversity.

• Make sure directors of graduate study and others involved in recruitment in individual departments are aware of all the funding available and understand the appropriate definitions of diversity categories.

• Work with departments whose numbers are significantly lower than the University’s targets to help them strategize recruitment and advertising.

• Foster use of “non-financial” sources of graduate support and professionalization, beginning with Career Services and ITLAL, while also including other GSO services.
- Encourage directors of graduate studies within departments — particularly in departments without their own teacher training program — to work with ITLAL to arranged training sessions for graduate cohorts in distinct disciplines; actively foster collaboration between departments and Career Services.

- Work to ensure that differential cuts to graduate funding across departments as a result of the economic crisis are managed in a way that does not provoke permanent divisions among departments and faculty; the process must include open and fair discussion, the perception that all departments have equal access to their respective dean’s ear, and serious investigation of all challenges to the criteria for measuring the strength of programs.

- Stress informed discussion over quality indicators and their measures be an integral part of the doctoral program review, with an eye to discipline-specific parameters as accepted by the national associations for each field; measure departments against peers; a department losing graduate lines should receive help, including funded initiatives, to regain strength by aligning its practices with standards in the discipline.
### Appendix 6.2 University Enrollment (from Enrollment Management Presentation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 04</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>16,293</td>
<td>18,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>11,388</td>
<td>13,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>4,905</td>
<td>4,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 6.3 Freshmen Enrolling by New York State Geographic Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 04</th>
<th>Fall 05</th>
<th>Fall 06</th>
<th>Fall 07</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital District</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Hudson</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Island</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Country</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western NY</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Counties</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 6.4 Undergraduate Enrollment by New York State/Out of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 04</th>
<th>Fall 05</th>
<th>Fall 06</th>
<th>Fall 07</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In State</td>
<td>10,559</td>
<td>11,112</td>
<td>11,545</td>
<td>11,836</td>
<td>12,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6.5 Out of State Freshman Enrollment, 2004-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 04</th>
<th>Fall 05</th>
<th>Fall 06</th>
<th>Fall 07</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other US</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 6.6 International Freshmen Enrollment, 2004-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 04</th>
<th>Fall 05</th>
<th>Fall 06</th>
<th>Fall 07</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 6.7 High School Graduation Projection(s), 2009-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>188,432</td>
<td>188,531</td>
<td>183,929</td>
<td>178,994</td>
<td>175,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>615,092</td>
<td>611,511</td>
<td>599,728</td>
<td>586,021</td>
<td>575,959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 6.8 Applications from Out of State Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1,054</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>1,474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 6.9 International Student Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 6.10 UAlbany SAT scores – Entering Freshman Cohorts, Traditional Only

*Source: Final UGA file*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>1,852</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>1,770</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>1,951</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>1080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Excludes scores for special admits

### Appendix 6.11 Racial Ethnicity Origin Fall 2004 and Fall 2008 (from Enrollment Management Presentation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>American Indian or Alaskan Native</th>
<th>Asian or Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Black, Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White, Non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Non-Resident Alien (a)</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>6952</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>7484</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>2302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Graduate** |                                  |                           |                     |          |                     |                        |         |
| Fall 2004 | 15                               | 110                       | 272                 | 166      | 3217                | 644                    | 481     |
| Fall 2008 | 19                               | 143                       | 260                 | 169      | 3197                | 701                    | 442     |
| % Change | 27%                              | 3.0%                      | -4.4%               | 1.8%     | .6%                 | 8.8%                   | -8.1%   |
Appendix 6.12 Percentage of Pell Grant Recipients: Fall 2006
Comparing UAlbany to Peer Institutions (from Enrollment Management presentation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Conn</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rochester</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo University</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State, University Park</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton University</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Brook</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University at Albany</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In State</td>
<td>10,559</td>
<td>11,112</td>
<td>11,545</td>
<td>11,836</td>
<td>12,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,388</td>
<td>12,013</td>
<td>12,457</td>
<td>12,748</td>
<td>13,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In State</td>
<td>3,887</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,957</td>
<td>3,907</td>
<td>3,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,905</td>
<td>5,027</td>
<td>4,977</td>
<td>4,936</td>
<td>4,931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 6.14 5-Year New Transfer Enrollment (from Enrollment Management Presentation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>1338</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>3790</td>
<td>4576</td>
<td>4715</td>
<td>4821</td>
<td>4744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>2327</td>
<td>2289</td>
<td>2351</td>
<td>2455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>1409</td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>1522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6.15 Transfer Admissions: Fall 2008 Top Sender Institutions — Public (from Enrollment Management presentation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>% of enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Valley Community College</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady Community College</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau Community College</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Greene Community College</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adirondack Community College</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester Community College</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutchess Community College</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk County Community College-Ammerman</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockland County Community College</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 6.16 Transfer Admissions: Fall 2008 Top Sender Institutions — Private

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saint John’s University, Queens</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of St. Rose</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Island University, Brooklyn</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica College, Syracuse University</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Institute of Technology</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage College, Albany</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstra University</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; Wales University, Manhattan College, Pace University, University of Hartford</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 6.17 Percentages of Students Offered Financial Aid Awards, 2008-09 (from Enrollment Management Presentation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of students offered awards</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>Fed Sub Stafford Loan</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>NYS TAP Grant</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Federal Unsub Stafford Loan</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Federal Pell Grant</td>
<td>$3,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Federal Work-Study Job*</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>Federal Acad Comp Grant</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Federal Perkins Loan*</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Federal Supplemental Grant*</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6.18

Second Year Retention Rate by Admit Type
Fall 2006 Entering Cohort

Appendix 6.19

University at Albany Retention and Graduation Rates
Appendix 6.20 Graduate Student Support by Source (in millions)
From Periodic Review Report June 1, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>SUNY</th>
<th>UALBANY*</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>$6.2</td>
<td>$7.5</td>
<td>$13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>$6.2</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
<td>$14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>$7.7</td>
<td>$13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>$7.7</td>
<td>$13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>$7.6</td>
<td>$13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>$7.6</td>
<td>$13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
<td>$14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
<td>$14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
<td>$14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*UAlbany number excludes non-academic units at $160K

Source: Office of Financial Management and Budget

Appendix 6.21 Carson Carr Graduate Diversity Scholars
(formerly known as the Graduate Teaching/Research Diversity Fellowship)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Number Supported</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$760,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>$1,361,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$1,067,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* mid-semester tuition increase in the spring, 2009 term as well as a funding cut that affected the number of students funded for the upcoming 2009-10 academic year.
**Projection of students to be funded in 2009-10; figures are somewhat fluid. Some students may not register/matriculate even though they have accepted an award.

Appendix 6.22 GTOP: Graduate Target of Opportunity -- Numbers of Students Funded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Summer Term</th>
<th>Fall Term</th>
<th>Spring Term</th>
<th>Individuals Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003 –04</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 –05</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 –06</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 –07</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 –08</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 –09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6.23 AGEP STEM Enrollment

Total number of enrolled AGEP students since inception-2003-2008

- Engineering (2003-present): 2
- Chemistry (2002-2008): 14
- Other Physical Sciences (2002-2008): 25
- Earth and Atmospheric Sciences (2002-2008): 3
- Biology (2002-2008): 37
- Psychology (2002-2008): 27
- Economics (2002-2008): 16
- Political Science (2002-2008): 19
- Other Social Sciences (2002-2008): 423

Appendix 6.24 AGEP: Fall 2008 enrollment information for STEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Albany</th>
<th>Binghamton</th>
<th>Buffalo</th>
<th>Stony Brook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of AGEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Ph.D. Students</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of AGEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Master’s Students</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of AGEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Students</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Participation Rate</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Rate</td>
<td>11 of 11=100%</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>29 of 32 =90%</td>
<td>23 of 24 =96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UAlbany STEM programs are the biological sciences, biomedical sciences, biopsychology, chemistry, computer science, environmental health sciences, Earth and atmospheric sciences, epidemiology and biostatistics, mathematics and statistics, nanoscale science and engineering, and physics. Seven faculty members are involved in AGEP.
## Appendix 6.25 Preparing for the Professoriate Program

### Participants - Preparing 2003-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Guests</th>
<th>No Shows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix 6.26 New York State

From 2005-2007 American Community Survey 3-Year Estimates Data Profile Highlights:

### ACS Demographic Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>U.S. Margin of Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>19,280,753</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>+/-8,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9,343,951</td>
<td>48.549.2%</td>
<td>+/-1,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9,936,802</td>
<td>51.550.8%</td>
<td>+/-1,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age (years)</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>(X) 36.4%</td>
<td>+/-0.2 [map]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>1,201,950</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>+/-808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 years and over</td>
<td>14,814,251</td>
<td>76.875.3%</td>
<td>+/-881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>2,527,954</td>
<td>13.112.5%</td>
<td>+/-964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One race</td>
<td>18,951,292</td>
<td>98.397.9%</td>
<td>+/-8,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>12,817,605</td>
<td>66.574.1%</td>
<td>+/-16,608 [map]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>3,004,630</td>
<td>15.612.4%</td>
<td>+/-9,436 [map]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>67,242</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>+/-2,407 [map]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1,301,199</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>+/-4,188 [map]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6,383</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>+/-1,005 [map]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td>1,754,233</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>+/-17,248 [map]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>329,461</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>+/-8,524 [map]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino (of any race)</td>
<td>3,126,718</td>
<td>16.214.7%</td>
<td>+/-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SOURCE: http://factfinder.census.gov*
## Appendix 6.27  
**SUNY Selectivity Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUNY State</th>
<th>Admissions</th>
<th>Retention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUNY State 1</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY State 2</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY State 3</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY State 4</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY State 5</td>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>Retention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table above is a simplified representation of the SUNY Selectivity Matrix. The actual matrix is much more detailed and includes specific data for each SUNY state.*
Appendix 6.28: Retention Objectives, Themes, Action Steps (from the Retention Committee Report)

Retention Objective #1
Better understanding of recent retention and attrition trends, characteristics of students who leave, reasons for departure, etc., in order to develop strategies to address specific problems or intervention strategies.

Action Steps:
1. Conduct ongoing analysis of:
   a. Recent freshmen cohorts to better understand who is leaving, when they are leaving (freshmen year, sophomore year, etc.), and why

Analysis should include:

**Student entry characteristics:**
- academic ability of departing students as measured in admissions data
- racial, ethnic data
- admit type

**Student Experiences at UA of departing students:**
- participation in EOP, Project Renaissance, honors, athletics, etc.
- resident/commuter
- academic performance/academic standing
- participation in academic support services
- involvement in FYE courses
- intended major and progress toward intended major

b. Course analysis
   - identify gateway courses and examine their role in academic difficulty and attrition (D<F<W rates, etc.)
   - analyze study group participation and measure effectiveness

c. “rising-junior” graduation reports for native and transfer cohorts

2. Create a meaningful exit survey and implement it consistently, including follow-up to departed students.

3. Develop strategies to address issues highlighted by the above analyses and communicate these findings to appropriate University officers for incorporation into unit planning and performance assessment.

4. Utilize available tools to predict persistence, based on incoming student characteristics.
Retention Objective #2
Improve retention rate freshman-to-sophomore year from 84.6% to 90% by 2010.

Theme A. A number of institutional efforts aimed at first-year students in both academic and social settings currently operate in silos that may limit their effectiveness.

   Action Step: Improve coordination (and assessment) of current and proposed First-Year Experience and support programs through appointment of a First-Year Coordinator.

Theme B. Students report that they are not aware of all the support programs available to them.

   Action Steps: Streamline and improve communication to students through:
   – development of a “virtual advisor” Website
   – regular email communications
   – “pop-ups” about important reminders and information
   – student handbook.

Theme C. Freshmen are unprepared for the academic expectations and other challenges of freshman year, and this contributes to attrition. SPC and fall orientation do not address these sufficiently.

   Action Steps:
   1. Develop a first-year experience course pilot that focuses on increasing:
      – understanding of academic expectations and acquisition of strategies and skills to meet the expectations
      – engagement (“connection”) with the University community
   2. Learn more about UA orientation programs and consider ways to improve

Theme D. 1st-year students do not have sufficient opportunities to interact with full-time faculty; course or discussion sections are taught by adjuncts or grad students; potential issues around student contact with full-time faculty in larger classes.

   Action Steps
   1. Develop plans to involve faculty in orientation programs
   2. “Lunch with your professor program,” targeted to freshmen in large lecture classes (by lottery)
   3. Pilot “learning communities,” where students would live together in the residence halls and take one course with the same group of students to promote integration of the intellectual and social components of learning.
Retention Objective #3

Improve retention and graduation rates of male students of color, who, according to IR data, continue to graduate be retained at rates lower than their female ethnic counterparts.

Action step: Identify a team to better understand the nature of the attrition problem (academic, financial, social, or personal) and to develop interventions to address the root cause(s) and develop an action plan.

Retention Objective #4

Improve the effectiveness of academic support services to address academic performance issues that contribute to attrition.

Theme A. Academic support services, including study skills and tutoring, are spread around the campus at various locations and are managed by various individuals; they tend to be utilized by Project Excel, EOP, and other specially identified populations, yet many students require academic assistance and do not take advantage of available help.

Action Steps:

1. Explore the creation of a learning center or an “Academic Help Desk” in a highly visible location to provide students with a locus for seeking academic assistance and a virtual help desk to provide “one stop” guidance for students seeking academic support services.

2. Develop tracking system to systematically identify students and the academic assistance they receive to determine if this assistance is bringing about desired results.

Retention Objective #5

Improve student progress to an appropriate major by increasing interaction between students and faculty.

Theme A. Students might be able to make better choices regarding a major if, early on, they had more information about the content of the field they are looking to pursue and the options associated with this field.

Action Steps:

1. Each academic department should be expected to:
   – hold informational programs for intended majors
   – develop an orientation (or welcome event) for new majors
   – participate in all University academic fairs for new and enrolled students
   – feature faculty from the department as speakers in an introductory course in the major who will discuss major and career paths in the major.
2. A continuum of interactions should be constructed that includes orientation programs, academic advisement in the Advisement Services Center, and activities within the academic program.
3. Each academic department should be aware of the success rates of students in its gateway and introductory courses and should have plans to provide academic support and employ other strategies to support student success in these courses.
4. Each department should be accountable for providing research opportunities for all students, including early opportunities available to freshmen and sophomores.
5. Students who enter as open majors and who are still exploring academic paths should be targeted for intervention early in their first semester.

Theme B. More opportunities are needed for learning outside the classroom which involve student/faculty interaction.

Action Step:

Increase efforts to draw faculty to co-curricular events and programs, such as move-in weekend, Danes after Dark, Fountain Day, athletic events, midnight basketball, etc., and provide means for interested faculty to generate additional such activities.

Retention Objective #6
Introduce a “customer service” ethic among all University offices and staffs who interact with students (administrative and academic units) in order to increase students’ sense that they are valued members of a University community which is committed to their success and satisfaction.

Theme A. Improvements needed to online services, and current procedures and policies.

1. Explore improvements available through the Student Financial Center, such as improved online services; reengineer business processes to eliminate unnecessary bureaucracies.
2. Develop plan for institution-wide customer service training and employee orientation.

Theme B. Too many students have too many holds that prevent them from registering. Goal would be to permit 100% of students to utilize advanced registration.

Action Step:

Share taskforce recommendations with the president’s Executive Committee.

Theme C. Students’ academic experiences create the impression that the University does not care about them, and this in turn affects their satisfaction and retention.

Action Step:
Improve course availability to ensure that students can get the courses they want when they want them.

Theme D. Student perception that the University “doesn’t care” about them.

Action Step:

1. Ask the President, Voice of the Student, etc. are mechanisms for collecting and responding to student feedback.

2. Meet annually with student leaders and elicit their feedback on student issues and concerns to inform Retention Committee deliberations.

3. Encourage increased involvement of undergraduates within shared governance.

Retention Objective #7
Increase pride and spirit at the University at Albany.

Action Step:

Explore current state by discussing with vise presidents of Student Success and Athletics Administration to consider plans to:
— Expand student spirit around athletic teams
— Maintain, enhance, revive and, as necessary, create UA “traditions” and a culture of shared campus values

Retention Objective #8
Address issues of transfer students that impeded their success, retention, and graduation.

Action Steps:

1. Develop and fund new “transfer advisor” position funding for 2006-2007

2. Identify issues and develop plans to evaluate them with appropriate assessment metrics.
Chapter 7: Student Support Services

Overview

The support provided to students in pursuit of their educational goals requires a well-organized program of services appropriate to the institutional mission and explicitly committed to learning and success. Student support services at the University at Albany have undergone substantial changes in the past decade, and address a spectrum of diverse and changing student needs. Many of the support areas discussed in this chapter fall under the purview of the Division of Student Success\(^1\); others fall under the purview of the Division of Academic Affairs. No matter where they fall organizationally, there is a shared responsibility to develop and support the opportunities that contribute to student success. Six key areas of student support have been identified for further discussion in this section: the Residential Community; Physical and Mental Health and Well-Being; Personal Safety, Security and Risk Management; Access to Resources for Special and/or Disadvantaged Populations; Services in Support of the Academic Mission; and Engaging in the Life of the University and Beyond. It should be noted that, in recent years, the increase in the number of students at the University has led to a decision to no longer provide housing for graduate students. In addition, with the exception of Student Financial Services and Information Technology Services, student services discussed below under the categories of Services in Support of the Academic Mission and Engaging in the Life of the University and Beyond are services offered solely to undergraduate students. All other services are available to both undergraduate and graduate students. Appendix 7.1 provides a brief explanation of data sources used in this chapter.

The Residential Community

Residential Life provides an “Inviting, Intellectual and Inclusive” living community that fosters academic success, personal growth and overall well-being. The mission is discussed during professional and student staff training, printed on staff t-shirts and otherwise reinforced with staff. A new programming model was adopted in 2007; it serves as the foundation for all programs conducted by the resident assistants (RAs) with their students (more than 1,000 programs each year). This model changes the past paradigm of focusing on categories of activities that were defined in terms of attendance to a new model that measures success in terms of reaching defined learning outcomes (Appendix 7.2). The purpose of the model is two-fold: to clearly foster the residential mission when working with students in residence, and to emphasize programs that achieve identified learning outcomes as the center of the residential experience. RAs are required to work closely with professional staff to develop programs that are intended to produce a certain outcome and to use evaluative tools with students at the program’s conclusion to assess results.

\(^1\) In 2006, the student affairs division of the University at Albany was renamed the Division of Student Success to better communicate to students the meaning of the units under this rubric. Consistent with the renaming of the division, a new mission was developed — Engage, Learn, Succeed; all units in the division are expected to cultivate the supportive environment necessary to engender learning and ultimate success.
Each semester since the inauguration in 2007 of this new programming model, Residential Life hosts a *Learning Outcomes Showcase* featuring outstanding programs and a brief ceremony to recognize the RAAs who worked on each project.

This model won an award from SUNY system administration in 2009 for Best Student Affairs Program in the SUNY system. Since the model has been in use, the Association of College and University Housing Officers International (ACUHO-I) survey results show that students who attended programming in the residence halls had higher satisfaction with certain factors, such as managing time (84%), studying effectively (80%), and solving problems (76%). In addition, 81% of students in this same survey reported that, as a result of their residential experience, they more than moderately interacted with students who were different from them; 77% said they benefitted from their interactions with residents who were different from them; and 80% said that living in on-campus housing enhanced their ability to appreciate other cultures. Appendix 7.3 provides a graph indicating that overall student satisfaction with the residential experience increased steadily since 2002.

Forty buildings are considered traditional (both suite and corridor style) residence halls and 50 are apartment-style buildings equipped with full-service kitchens. While approximately 56% of the undergraduate population (including 92-95% of freshmen) resides on campus, there is a need for additional beds. There currently is no space available for graduate student housing and in most years, late transfer admits are turned away when requesting on campus housing. The “crunch” on campus is due to several factors, including the lack of acceptable housing off campus and the appeal of apartment-style housing for upper-class students. Appendix 7.4 provides information about the number of beds provided and the level of satisfaction of the facilities during the self-study period.

The housing sign-up process continues to be a concern of students as evidenced in the ACUHO-I EBI Resident Survey. Residential Life has made substantial changes in the lottery sign-up process to address this issue and now includes grade point average as well as academic status in assigning lottery numbers. An online process was also created for all students (new and returning) to complete housing information. Despite these changes requested by students, satisfaction with this process still remains a “top priority” for attention; the demand for apartment housing remains higher than the available supply and, until this is addressed with the new housing complex, the low rating in this area will likely remain unresolved.

Residential Life has taken several steps to increase availability in student housing, including the elimination of the requirement for sophomores to live on campus, conversion of lounge space to bedrooms in freshmen areas, and the elimination of enhanced single bedrooms. While these are not optimal, they were short-term steps necessary to accommodate an unexpected growth in the undergraduate student population in 2005 and 2006 as well as in 2009. Plans are underway to build an additional 500 beds on campus to alleviate the overcrowding, accommodate graduate students, and allow for swing space to facilitate a quicker renovation schedule of the traditional halls built in the 1960s. The need for this housing was confirmed in a market study completed in 2006 by SLAM Architects, PC.²

The services provided by the dining operation on campus are critical to the overall satisfaction of students, most especially those living in traditional residence halls where meal plans are mandatory. University Auxiliary Services oversees the food service operation and Chartwell’s has held the contract on the campus since 2000. Chartwell’s is currently responsible for more than 5,500 residential meal plans and 889 off-campus plans per semester.

Chartwell’s mission, “Eat, Learn, Live,” clearly represents its commitment to provide the food and nutrition that will help students succeed in their education at UAlbany, while laying the foundation for a long, healthier life. Chartwell’s has increased nutrition education in the dining locations and has brought a nutritionist on staff who is very responsive to students’ dietary needs. This individual works one-on-one with any student who is having challenges identifying healthy choice options. Nutritional menus are readily available and retail foods options have been expanded to include vegan, vegetarian, organic, and kosher items. In addition, many strides have been made in buying food products locally. Special meal accommodations are made for Muslim and Jewish holidays, and chefs host regular taste tests and cooking courses for international student groups. Authenticity of ethnic foods remains difficult to attain, and dining services is working to increase the variety of ethnic foods on the menus. Efforts to bring ethnic caterers to campus are a challenge as these enterprises do not necessarily meet the campus’s health and safety requirements for caterers.

Satisfaction with dining services on campus has consistently been one of the lowest areas of contentment for resident students as recorded in the ACUHO-I benchmarking surveys. For the fourth consecutive time since the ACUHO-I study was first administered (administered previously in 2002, 2004 and 2006), dining services remained a ‘top priority’ among students in 2008; i.e., students perceived dining services as having a high level of importance but with low levels of satisfaction. The quality of food remained among the lowest rated items on the survey, with little improvement during the ACUHO-I survey’s administration (Educational Benchmarking Institute & ACUHO-I, 2008, University at Albany). Similarly, the 2006 and 2008 NACUFS (National Association of College and University Food Services) surveys of UAlbany students found high rates of dissatisfaction with dining services overall, including in the areas of taste, variety of menu choices, speed of service, friendliness of staff, and layout of facilities.

It should be noted, however, that University Auxiliary Services and Chartwell’s have been proactive in taking a number of steps to improve the satisfaction of food services and the data indicate there has been slow progress. The satisfaction with quality of food, variety of dining plan options, and value of the dining plan has shown incremental improvement from 2004 to 2006 and to 2008. But dining continues to be the “top priority” for attention in the residence halls in predicting overall satisfaction with the residential experience.

It is recommended that the University move forward with the construction of additional housing on campus and continue to closely monitor the demand for on-campus housing. The University should also take a closer look at the data made available through the UAS, NACUFS and the ACUHO surveys, as there is evidence that despite significant progress in student/customer satisfaction with dining services, further improvements are needed.
Physical and Mental Health and Well-Being

The University Health Center (UHC) and the University Counseling Center (UCC) provide a range of primary acute care services, prevention-focused education and broad-based psychological services to the University’s undergraduate and graduate students. New initiatives that address high-risk drinking, sexual health, sexual assault prevention, sports psychology/ performance enhancement and suicide prevention are also a focus. In fall 2007, the University established a Sexual Assault Resource Center and now has a full-time psychologist dedicated to sexual assault prevention and the support of victims.

UHC and UCC were relocated in summer 2008 to a new medical professional building approximately one mile from the Uptown Campus, with an accessible shuttle for transport. The move was necessitated because of the former facility’s condition; it lacked air conditioning, and was inadequate for running efficient patient exam rooms and maintaining privacy. A communication campaign to inform students about the move was launched in the spring 2008 term and continued into fall 2008. After one year in the new location, total visits to UHC declined by 8% (from 18,909 to 16,314). During the same time period, however, UCC experienced a 5% increase in the number of students who received psychological counseling (Appendix 7.5).

The American College Health Association Patient Satisfaction Assessment Survey (ACHA-PSAS) administered to students in spring 2009, indicates that over 92% of students were satisfied or very satisfied with the cleanliness and appearance of the building as well as its capacity to maintain confidentiality and privacy. Feedback from student clients solicited by clinicians suggests that most prefer the new location; efforts continued this year to communicate the change in location, including an Open House for the entire community in early September. Appendix 7.6 provides graphs from data collected over the past three years regarding both student satisfaction with the overall quality of care and the percentage of students who would recommend the UHC.

UCC and Residential Life participate in a joint preventative program called CARE Net (Consultation and Resource Evaluation); it provides an alternative to disciplinary action for disruptive behavior that emerges within the context of suicide threats, attempts, or actions. Focusing on follow-ups with appropriate support systems such as parents, CARE Net has been completed by 86 students; their grade-point averages show an increase for the semester following the program compared to the semester of the incident and the semester before. Appendix 7.7 shows a graph of CARE Net referrals over the past five years.

Because issues of suicidal ideation and other behaviors continue to present an ongoing challenge, UCC developed and implemented a training initiative, the Save-A-Life Program, to inform faculty and staff of the warning signs for suicide and teach them identification and referral skills. Pre-training and post-training assessments of Save-A-Life reveal significant increases in both knowledge and comfort for those staff trained to: identify risk factors that could lead to suicide; interact with distressed students; and make appropriate mental health referrals.
Additional data from the ACHA-PSAS indicate that 95% of students who used the Health Center services were satisfied or very satisfied, although 22% indicated they could not get an appointment during the time needed, had to wait too long, or were not able to get the provider they wanted. Data collected from UCC-sponsored educational programs (alcohol and drug prevention, AIDS and sexuality, sexual assault prevention) suggest that 95% of students would recommend that other students attend the program.

In response to national concerns and campus-based data that reveal UAlbany students exhibited high-risk drinking at levels higher than the national cohort and even higher than the Northeast region, the campus established a comprehensive Alcohol Prevention Program. Based on the model developed by the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention in Higher Education, this program focuses both on individual and environmental change within a comprehensive model that includes interventions at the universal level (for the entire campus) and at the selective and indicated levels (for students who are exhibiting risk behaviors). Key elements of the model include leadership and campus-wide input from the President’s Advisory Council on the Prevention of High-Risk Drinking and Related Risk Behaviors, the STEPS³ Comprehensive Alcohol Screening and Brief Intervention Program, an award-winning early intervention program for high-risk drinkers, a model peer assistance program and a well-established and recognized social norms campaign. Coordination for this program lies with the President’s Advisory Council and the Division of Student Success, with guidance from the professional experts in UCC, which maintains and updates the University’s Biennial Review document mandated by the U.S. Department of Education.

The STEPS program, introduced in 2004, is designed to reduce alcohol use frequency and quantity, along with associated negative consequences, among students through interventions that meet the very distinct and complex needs of target populations of high-risk drinkers. The program has shown both statistically and clinically significant results, and received the 2009 NASPA Grand Gold Award for the Best Student Affairs Program in the country, as well as the NASPA National Award for Excellence in Health and Counseling Services. In 2009, it was the nation’s sole winner of the American College Health Association’s Best Practices in College Health Award this year. In July 2009, the U.S. Department of Education recognized STEPS as a model alcohol abuse prevention program and awarded UCC a grant of $220,000 to apply this intervention to UAlbany fraternity and sorority members.

Assessment of STEPS’ effectiveness was conducted through comparison of baseline and six-month self-report measures assessing student alcohol use, associated negative consequences, and use of protective behaviors. Six-month follow-up outcomes indicated reductions in drinking and associated negative consequences on more than 25 indices, including drinks per week, peak drinking, and choosing not to drink. The STEPS program succeeded in correcting student misperceptions about the prevalence of alcohol on campus; students’ more realistic understanding of alcohol use correlated with lower alcohol use among those participating in the program. These changes were evident across all high-risk target populations, including first-year students, student-athletes, and students seeking health and counseling services on campus. Based

³ STEPS stands for: S Screening First Year Students for Alcohol Use and Related Behaviors & Consequences; T Targeting High Risk Drinkers; E Engaging High Risk Drinkers in Brief Alcohol Interventions; P Preventing High Risk Alcohol Use and Promoting Healthy Behaviors; S Sustaining Success
on its success, the STEPS program was recommended by the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy as part of the 2009 President’s National Drug Control Strategy.

The UCC has a strong and widely recognized “social norms” campaign to inform the University community that UAlbany students, contrary to misperceptions, are making healthy choices. The campaign provides members of the University community with accurate information about UAlbany students in the form of messages taken from The National College Health Assessment conducted in 2004, 2006 and 2008. In 2007, UAlbany students developed a PSA that earned a statewide award from the New York State Office of Alcohol and Substance Abuse Services (OASAS) Statewide. This PSA reported facts about the health behaviors of college students and was shown in TV spots throughout New York State. Spring 2008 National College Health Assessment data indicate that, in comparison to 2004, there is evidence of a change toward the norm of reduced alcohol use. Specifically, data show the following significant changes:

- **17% reduction** in the number of students who think the typical UAlbany student drinks daily
- **32% increase** in the number of abstinent students
- **14% increase** in the number of students who drink once a week or less
- **25% increase** in the number of students who abstain from heavy episodic drinking (5+drinks on one occasion)

The Middle Earth Peer Assistance Program is a nationally-recognized prevention service staffed by trained and professionally supervised undergraduate and graduate students. The program offers course credits to undergraduates who provide information, referral and education through a hotline and peer education programs, with over 1,600 contacts annually. Middle Earth distributes information to the campus community through its column entitled “Middle Earth Roots” in the Albany Student Press. Since 2000, Middle Earth has received numerous awards and grants, including a U.S. Department of Education model program designation, the Exemplary Substance Abuse Prevention Program Award from the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and recognition as a model alcohol abuse prevention program by the U.S. Department of Education.

Project SHAPE (Sexual Health and Peer Education) provides peer education and training in sexual health promotion through a variety of interactive workshops on sexual health topics, healthy behaviors and connections to resources on and off campus. In keeping with the national goals set forth in American College Health Association’s Healthy Campus 2010 objective, Project SHAPE’s 35 peer educators conduct more than 120 educational programs for the University community each year in residence halls, for student groups, and in academic classes.

**Personal Safety, Security and Risk Management**

The University takes a multifaceted approach to safety and security in order to foster a culture of shared responsibility. The 2008 Profile of the American College Student indicates that 82% of UAlbany students consider campus safety an important factor when deciding which college to attend.
The University Police Department (UPD) maintains police and security personnel throughout the campus 24/7 with an average response time to all calls for assistance of less than two minutes (Appendix 7.8, UPD staffing). UPD relocated to a new facility in 2001 — a move that not only increased the department’s square footage but also enhanced its ability to effectively manage its staff and operations. This facility is utilized as the emergency operations center in the event of a severe campus-wide emergency.

UPD begins communicating with students about safety at new-student orientation programs and continues a safety communication campaign throughout the year. There has been an expansion of Web-based services on the UPD site to improve access to safety information. In addition to the yearly crime statistics published as part of the Clery Act, the site includes crime-mapping information for the City of Albany and informational videos on safety-related topics such as DWI and sexual assault.

The University at Albany is a safe campus. Comparison data indicates that UAlbany has the lowest crime per 1,000 students the four SUNY University Centers (Appendix 7.9 on campus crime trends). Student perception of safety is important as well; according to the 2008 Re-Accreditation Survey, 73% of undergraduates believe that UPD is either somewhat or very effective at informing students about its services, and 61% were either somewhat or very satisfied about those services. This is an improvement from the 2006 Student Opinion Survey, where 54% of students expressed satisfaction with “personal safety/security” on campus.

Residential Life staff assists with safety initiatives by establishing personal safety, security, and fire safety procedures and practices with students. Residence halls are locked at all times with card access to exterior doors. There are phones in the vestibules of the residence halls to make on-campus calls and there are phones in each suite equipped for emergency calls. All suite doors are outfitted with key locks and peepholes. While the 2008 ACUHO-I EBI resident survey indicates that 76% of students are satisfied with the security of possessions in their room, UPD statistics bear out that 30% of overall crime on campus is theft, and more than 90% of these thefts are crimes of opportunity due to unattended property. Of the remaining 70%, the highest number of crimes include: criminal mischief (vandalism, not graffiti), 19%; unlawful possession of marihuana (simple possession), 8%; and aggravated unlicensed operation (driving on a suspended license), 7%.

The safety of UAlbany students off campus has been the focus of attention of a variety of ongoing safety initiatives. While the number of student crime victims remains relatively low over the past 10 years when compared to the previous decade, there remain some areas of concern (Appendix 7.9). Even with a 10% decrease in off-campus crime from 2005-2007, physical assaults of UAlbany students off campus increased during the same period, from 10 to 23. The Office of Personal Safety & Off-Campus Affairs works in conjunction with UPD and Albany city police to improve the safety of students off campus as well as improve relations between the University and the larger community in Albany. The Committee on University and Community Relations, chaired by the director of the Office of Personal Safety & Off-Campus Affairs, comprises a diverse group of UAlbany students and professional staff, as well as Albany police, personnel from other local colleges, local tavern owners and neighborhood associations. This group has been in existence for over 19 years and is a force for improving the safety and quality.
of life for off-campus students. In 2006, this committee was recognized as a “Model Program” by the U.S. Department of Education’s Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Models on College Campuses and, in 2007, received further recognition as an “Innovative Program” by the New York State Office of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse.

After the tragic events of 9/11, the University established a campus-wide emergency response team to develop a more coordinated campus response to a major emergency; within two years, a comprehensive emergency response plan was established and implemented. The University also made significant progress in establishing a campus emergency notification system (NY-Alert), training UPD command staff and senior administrators on NIMS (National Incident Management System) compliance, and defining campus roles in the event of a major emergency.

In spring 2008, the President appointed a Behavior Risk Assessment Committee (called BRisk), a critical decision-making and advisory group responsible for ensuring that necessary risk-assessment policies and programs are in place for the campus community. This team has developed a comprehensive campus-wide prevention plan; a sub-group is the College and University Behavioral Intervention Team, a preventative effort to get ahead of possible issues that could escalate over time. This group meets regularly to triage reports, assess risk and provide resources or interventions as appropriate. Thirteen cases were reviewed in spring 2008 and an additional 26 in the 2008-2009 academic year.

**Access to Resources for Special and/or Disadvantaged Populations**

The University works to foster respect for its community’s diversity, ensuring that all students are extended a full and equal place. To that end, it pays particular attention to special and disadvantaged populations in order to ensure appropriate access to University resources in a safe and supportive environment.

The Disability Resource Center (DRC) ensures that more than 500 disabled and learning disabled students will have a fully accessible living and learning environment while taking advantage of the University’s programs and activities. A demographic study of students utilizing the services of the DRC revealed that in fall 2008 157 out of 412 (38%) students registered with the DRC had a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher; 81% of the undergraduates had a cumulative GPA of 2.86. For graduate students, 76 out of 84 (90%) had cumulative GPAs above 3.0. The University at Albany’s Alternative Testing Program is a model program for other campuses, especially with regard to the outpouring of volunteers who come from various academic departments and offices across campus to make this possible. Trend data on students’ GPAs show that grades improve for students who have disabilities once they register with this office and receive services, and that registering with the DRC gives students the same chance to do well as the average student. Of students who participated in the UAlbany DRC Survey in 2008, 79% reported positive experiences with the DRC.

In spring 2008 the University reestablished the Office of Multicultural Student Success (eliminated in budget cuts in 2001), staffing it with one full-time professional. Considered essential to enhancing the University’s broad mission of excellence in education, this office is committed to developing and maintaining a culturally inclusive and supportive campus.
environment which promotes and enhances the academic excellence, personal growth and leadership development of African, Latino, Asian and Native American heritage (ALANA) students. The office collaborates with others on campus, most specifically the Office of Diversity and Affirmative Action, the Department of Residential Life CHARGE Program, and the Office of International Student Education, to ensure that students benefit from the rich diversity of UAlbany. In addition to mentoring student leaders and facilitating and co-sponsoring educational and social activities to foster cultural awareness, the office works directly with multicultural student organizations and Greek councils to guide them on the skills necessary for effective leadership.

The 2008 survey Profile of the American College Student, conducted by NASPA, reveals that 93.47% of UAlbany students believe that their campus is diverse; 70.08% say the diversity of the campus was an important factor in their decision to come to UAlbany. The University will continue to support individuals of diverse backgrounds and assist the entire community to value, appreciate and learn from its diversity. The same survey indicates 61% of UAlbany students have become more open-minded about diversity issues since coming to the University, compared to a 58% national average; also, 62% of students have become more aware of racial, ethnic and cultural differences since starting at UAlbany; the national average is 59%.

The University is a member of the National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI), which facilitates diversity awareness — some areas of possible misunderstanding and intolerance. Each year, UAlbany’s NCBI chapter offers approximately a dozen training sessions for a number of different departments and units. Some of these annual trainings are for specific undergraduate and graduate classes by request of the professor. NCBI-trained personnel also regularly train all of the staffs from the Department of Residential Life (over 200) and Middle Earth (120+). NCBI has also done training sessions for the Students Association, all incoming freshmen and transfers, Greek letter organizations, Hillel, the PRIDE Alliance and numerous others. During the 2008-2009 academic year, more than 500 students received some form of NCBI training. There is an annual Train-the-Trainer session in the Capital Region; to date, more than 1,000 faculty, staff and students have received NCBI certification.

The University does not currently have an office dedicated to the needs of the LGBTQI student population on campus. A graduate student from the Office of Multicultural Student Success currently staffs the LGBTQ resource center on a part-time basis. In 2009, a campus-wide advisory group was formed to discuss LGBTQ issues and to examine concerns related to this population. The group will make recommendations regarding future steps to fully support LGBTQI students, faculty and staff.

Services in Support of the Academic Mission

Advisement

At the time of the previous Middle States report, the Advisement Services Center (ASC) had begun changing the model used to provide advising services by staffing the office with full-time professional academic advisors instead of relying on graduate student assistants. This shift is now complete, as is a change to a focus on developmental advisement, instead of prescriptive
advising. Student Learning Outcomes (Appendix 7.11) were developed to guide the work of the office. These changes have been positively received by students, as noted by the assessment data detailed below.

A variety of programming is offered through ASC each year. These programs aim to strengthen student connections to advisors and faculty, to assist in identifying academic interests, and to teach skills for managing administrative student details.

ASC caseloads are higher than national averages for four-year public institutions; 400 students per advisor in ASC versus 285 students per advisor nationally (“The Status of Academic Advising: Findings from the ACT Sixth National Survey” 2004). Lower caseloads would increase the ability of each advisor to do outreach to students in need, as well as increase the amount of time available to each student.

Once students declare their major, academic advisement is provided by the academic department that hosts the major. Departments use different advising models; these range from all department faculty providing advising, to a small group of faculty handling all the students, to maintenance of a professional advisor line within the department.

Data for assessing advising services are taken from several sources. These include the Advisement Services Exit Survey (2003 – 2008), the Student Opinion Survey (1994 – 2006), and the Student Experience Survey (2005). The ASC Survey is administered through the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness. Survey questions are directly related to the Student Learning Outcomes. This survey has been administered since fall 2003 and provides information clustered by semester. While the response rate for this survey is quite low (range of n=50 to n=185), responses suggest that between fall 2003 and spring 2008, the percentage of students attaining the learning outcomes has improved. One measure of the improvement is that, for each item on the survey, the highest or second highest mean across the years was attained in 2006-2007 or 2007-2008. These include understanding graduation requirements, using DARS for academic planning, knowing what it takes to be academically successful, understanding the purpose of the General Education program, and several items related to access to ASC advisors and the comfort level in asking them for assistance (data available upon request).

The Student Experience Survey is also administered by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness. The 2005 Survey reported that, across 12 scale items, freshmen agreement with positive aspects of their experience with advisors averages 3.97 on a five-point scale. Freshmen are most likely to see their advisors as helpful and knowledgeable, saying they are concerned with their personal growth, encourage them to talk about themselves and their college experience, and help identify career areas that fit their skills, abilities and interests. Freshmen see their advisors as easy to talk to and available when needed.

The Student Opinion Survey is promoted by SUNY system administration but administered locally. The 2006 Survey provides some comparative data on satisfaction with ASC-provided

---

4 The spring 2009 Student Opinion Survey results were not available at the time of this writing, but have been publically posted as Research Report No. 27: “2009 SUNY Student Opinion Survey: Report on Trends and Key Findings.” (December 2009) on the IRPE Assessment Report webpage at http://www.albany.edu/ir/reports.htm.
advising and departmental advising. Consistent with the 2003 Student Opinion Survey, the 2006 Survey found that students were more satisfied with their ASC advisement than with departmental advisement:

“Academic Services: Almost half (48%) of respondents were very satisfied or satisfied with centralized academic advisement services, another 26 percent neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Satisfaction was lowest for academic advising within the major (43%).

The results of the survey are addressed further in Chapter 9, including recommendations regarding advising within the major.

**Services for Transfer Students**

In 2007, the position of Transfer Experience Coordinator was created in order to improve services for transfer students, a need that was indicated by a variety of data sources, including student engagement and student opinion surveys. The primary goals in creating this position were:

- To provide better academic and extracurricular services for the transfer population in order to increase student satisfaction and retention rates
- To create a supportive network for transfer students who may struggle academically and socially upon their transition to the University
- To strengthen relationships with local “feeder” institutions as a way of making transitions more seamless

In the past two years, these goals have been pursued through a variety of programs. The UA Transfer Connections mentoring program was designed to pair new and at-risk transfer students with faculty, staff, and peer mentors on campus. A chapter of Tau Sigma National Honor Society was established in order to recognize the achievements of transfer students and give them an outlet for campus and community involvement. A listserv directed at all transfer students was created in order to allow better email communication with this population. In addition, a variety of programs and communications have been established with local community colleges in order to facilitate stronger relationships between institutions. This position will continue to develop as the needs of this population change, and, as the programs become more established, additional assessment will needed to be conducted to examine the impact of new services on transfer students’ educational experience.

**Student Financial Services**

During the past decade, all student services have been revamped to maximize seamless “self service” via the Web for all students, and to provide “single-stop” financial services for students and families requiring assistance. While the previous Middle States self-study revealed that students were satisfied with financial services, opportunities presented by the conversion of the student information system to PeopleSoft in 2003, and the addition Touchnet financial services in 2007, have led to the development of a broad range of online activity replacing paper and in-person transactions. Students can now complete virtually all University business (registration, payment, accepting/declining financial aid, etc.) via
“MyUAlbany,” as well as access key services, such as enrollment verification. At the Touchnet Website, students can also pay tuition, set up an authorized user (a parent or designee), and set up to receive an e-refund.

Simultaneously, financial services have been consolidated to a single point of contact to reduce “runaround” by students, as well as to optimize service by a limited staff. Students needing to resolve financial matters that involve either the Student Accounts or Financial Aid units are serviced at the “Student Services Center;” staffing has been enhanced with professionals who are able to provide financial and financial aid counseling. Space in the Campus Center was remodeled to provide more appropriate private spaces, while the Student Services Center performs the “back end” processing. Because UAlbany is unable to meet all students’ demonstrated financial need, students are advised of alternate funding sources, such as loans, scholarship opportunities and payment plans. The E-Payment Plan also allows students to pay charges in four monthly installments per term.

Staffing in the Student Services Center has decreased over the past few years, with a loss of four full-time positions in the past year alone. Through restructuring, renovations, and enhanced technology, however, services to students have remained largely intact. Advancements in technology, in particular, have mitigated the negative impact on student service. In fact, the Student Financial Center now disburses financial aid almost entirely electronically. Appendix 7.10 includes a chart showing aid disbursed by the Financial Aid unit during the past decade. The chart indicates that the amount of financial aid processed through the unit has been steadily increasing, and over $143 million was disbursed in 2008-2009. In 2008-2009, the Student Accounts area processed more than 40,000 financial aid refunds, and more than $225 million in payments, with 94% of all payments processed via E-Pay.

These units also recognize the special needs of UAlbany’s diverse population. Training with other offices has focused on improving service to unique populations, such as international students, transfer students, disabled students, Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) students, and graduate students. Each of these areas is also working to enhance services for veterans; there are 178 veterans or dependent family members enrolled in the GI Bill program. The director of the Student Services Center (himself a veteran) is assigned the task of coordinating communication and information on veterans affairs issues, and an assistant registrar has responsibility for issues pertaining to the G.I. Bill. Student Financial Services staff members also participate in summer orientation programs, educating students and parents on services offered. Once enrolled, contact with students continues via e-mails and MyUAlbany, residential life programs and other campus events.

While organizational changes have made it challenging to establish a baseline to measure performance, some data and feedback mechanisms are available. First, there has been a reduction in phone calls and an increase in answered calls between 2008 and 2009. From mid July to the second day of class in 2009, the number of calls to the Student Services Center decreased by 21% (from 18,139 in 2008 to 14,276 in 2009). In addition, 57.1% were answered in 2009, compared to 36.1% in 2008.

Second, Student Opinion Survey data collected every three years revealed a recent increase in student satisfaction with “billing and payment procedures.” On a five-point scale, this category has improved from 3.41 in 2000 to 3.67 in 2009. Third, in the student survey undertaken for this
self-study, Student Financial Services received a 3.69 rating for “effectiveness in informing students about the services” and a 3.61 for student satisfaction with the services.

The University offers a Tuition Appeals Committee where student appeals are regularly heard and adjudicated. The committee includes representatives from a variety of administrative offices. Additionally, numerous Financial Aid programs have formal appeal processes, either by federal and state policy or by policy set by the Student Financial Center.

**Information Technology Services**

Information technology services are offered at UAlbany by the Information Technology Services (ITS) unit. The mission of ITS is to …offer [the University] a sophisticated IT environment that advances enriched learning experiences, excellence in teaching, service, and distinguished research programs commensurate with its status as a nationally recognized public university. ITS provides direct services to UAlbany students to enable them to pursue their studies and enrich their overall experience. Technology and online services have become an integral part of campus life, and these services are used heavily. ITS also provides the infrastructure, services and support that underlie a number of other student services described in this chapter. Students are given access to and information about IT services even before they arrive on campus. ITS plays an integral part in helping new students acclimate to the University.

IT services help students get and stay connected with multiple facets of their lives, including academics, extra-curricular, and social activities. As members of the campus community, they receive an email account, wired and wireless network access, file and Web space, printing services, and access to a host of applications, such as the Blackboard Course Management System (described in Chapter 9, Educational Offerings and General Education) and MyUAlbany portal, in support of numerous academic and business transactions. Additionally, ITS offers a variety of training courses to help students maximize the utility of campus technology resources.

The Office of the CIO uses a variety of mechanisms to evaluate students’ satisfaction with campus IT services. Comments, concerns and complaints can be directed to the CIO mailbox (cio@albany.edu) or the ITS Service Desk at any time. Town Hall-style meetings and participation in both the EDUCAUSE Core Data Survey and EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research (ECAR) Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology have provided ITS with valuable student input and comparable statistics about IT services at similar institutions. Despite the fact that IT funding per student at UAlbany is 30-50% below that of peer institutions, ITS provides students with a competitive portfolio of services. One of ITS’s most important feedback mechanisms is a student advisory board. Established in 2006, this group provides the CIO with on-going feedback on campus IT services and plays an informative and influential role; many of the concerns raised by its members have helped shape and improve the services available to students. ITS tracks system up-time and a variety of other metrics to evaluate the availability of campus services.

The University’s appetite for both new and improved IT services appears to be insatiable, and there are always more projects than ITS has resources to provide. These run the gamut from additional support for core services (more evening/weekend coverage for the ITS Helpdesk,
additional staffing for classroom technology support, and upgrades to a variety of business applications) to new services (more collaboration and online tools).

Limited staffing and resources also constrain ITS’s ability to respond to offices’ requests for IT improvements and/or new systems that would serve students. This puts a premium on mutual priority-setting and planning with the University’s divisions so that available resources can be used to their maximum effect. For more information on staffing, see the section on ITS In Chapter 3, Institutional Resources.

**Academic Support Services**

Academic support for students needing assistance with improving their academics and maintaining academic excellence is provided by the Office of Academic Support Services (OASS). A variety of academic support services are provided, including weekly study skills workshops, tutoring, and faculty mentoring, to name a few.

Each semester, 11 study skills workshops are offered at no cost to all students, with freshmen highly encouraged to participate. These one-hour sessions focus on transition issues such as time management, plagiarism, memory enhancement, listening skills (in order to better learn from lectures), and fostering self-motivation. Spring 2008 data suggest that on average attendance for these workshops were 15 students per session. Up until fall 2009, OASS also provided free study groups in 24 first-year courses, e.g., introductory courses in biology, chemistry, economics, mathematics and statistics, and so on. These study groups, held twice a week for two hours each, allowed students to review class discussions and course material and enabled the participants to prepare for exams. These study groups were discontinued in fall 2009 as a result of budget cuts. OASS does, however, provide a clearinghouse for students seeking tutoring in these subjects and others. Tutors must have a cumulative grade point average of 3.0 or better and have received at least a B+ in the course for which they are tutoring. Tutors are paid by the students receiving tutoring. The University also has an “early warning system,” whereby professors identify students experiencing problems and encourage them to utilize available academic and advising services. The warning is in lieu of a mid-semester grade.

In addition, OASS is the home of Project EXCEL, which provides academic assistance to low income, first generation, and disabled students with the goal of increasing their retention and graduation rates. Project EXCEL offers its students a variety of University-wide support services, including academic counseling, free-study group tutorials, and study skills workshops. Additionally, Project EXCEL students receive other comprehensive programming, such as supplemental advisement, personal counseling, and free peer-tutoring.

While the programs provided through OASS provide a national model that has been adopted at other colleges and universities around the country, to date there has been no formal assessment of the impact of these services on overall student retention, graduation or academic performance.

Physical access to the Advisement Services Center is extremely difficult for mobility-impaired persons. Addressing this with a ramp or electric lift in the stairwell outside the Lecture Centers would provide access to ASC, EOP/Academic Support, the Office of the Vice Provost for
Undergraduate Education, Project Renaissance and the Lecture Centers. Also, since advisor caseloads are significantly higher than national averages, strategies should be considered to lower this ratio and/or to review alternative models designed to provide similar services. It is reasonable to assume that an advisor with fewer students can then spend more time with each, and that additional time with advisors would contribute to more satisfied students, which in turn would contribute to stronger retention. Although students receiving services from OASS appear to value the services provided, there is need for empirical evidence of the impact of these services. OASS should be encouraged to develop an assessment plan to evaluate the impact of its services.

**Engaging in the Life of the University and Beyond**

University at Albany students are encouraged early in their collegiate career, beginning with their orientation to campus, to explore the opportunities available to become actively involved in campus life. The Office of Student Involvement and Leadership actively lends support to creating an environment on campus that promotes and directs this involvement. Some of the more recent endeavors that have been implemented to support student engagement are late-night programming on weekends (Danes After Dark), the Emerging Leaders program, the consistent use of social networking and Web-based software (MyInvolvement) to facilitate club membership and the production of co-curricular transcripts. Late-night activities have increased with the Danes After Dark program from 11,000 attendees in 2005 to 17,500 in 2008. The late-night professional position that oversees this program was lost as a result of budget reductions, yet the full continuation of this program is fundamental to supporting student engagement in healthy late night activities that support leadership, involvement, and alternatives to hanging out on downtown streets.

Campus traditions are sustained to support a shared sense of pride in the University. These traditions include the Candle Lighting Ceremony, Torch Night, Clash of the Quads and Fountain Day. Fountain Day attendance has increased from 4000 students in 2004 to more than 7,000 in 2009. Clash of the Quads has also experienced increases, with improved attendance from upper-class students due to concerted efforts to advertise and make these events attractive to students.

Recreation is an integral part of the lives of many UAlbany students who participate in club sports, intramurals and other recreational activities such as aerobic exercise and weightlifting. The University continues to seek out new resources to build recreational facilities (see the Athletics Master Plan) and obtain the financial capital to provide adequate staffing for managing and supervising such activities.

The Campus Center, the hub of student interaction on campus, has an outdated configuration and aging infrastructure in desperate need of rehabilitation. A $30M appropriation from the State of New York will make possible a 50,000 square-foot addition, and a total rehabilitation of the current space is planned as well. Opportunities to strengthen student engagement with a wellness center, a multipurpose auditorium, increased meeting space, and co-mingled student and staff offices are being explored.
The campus judicial processes have been reexamined and a new model of *Restorative Justice* was implemented in 2008 for a small number of pilot cases. Restorative Justice focuses on communal relationship building, and engages the responsible party, as well as the parties harmed by their behavior, in a dialogue that seeks to repair harm. The goal is to design a process that reintegrates the responsible party into the community. As part of this new process, the University Community Accountability Board was introduced to the UAlbany community; to date, 50 faculty, students and staff have been trained as facilitators and 21 cases resolved using this method during its first two years of operation (Appendix 7.12).

The University at Albany NASPA Consortium Campus Safety/Student Conduct Student Benchmark Survey conducted in spring 2009 found that while 60% of students surveyed believed they understood the rationale for student conduct decisions, only 42% believed that sanctions were educational in nature and 31% believed the process helped clarify their values, beliefs or goals. These results, along with a goal to expand the restorative justice model, precipitated retraining of residence hall professional staff in fall 2009 to promote more value-laden interactions with students when dealing with disciplinary issues. Staff are educated to promote an environment where accountability and civic responsibility are fundamental principles to be upheld and supported. Training will help empower community members to better understand, embrace and put into practice the theories of restorative justice.

Finally, Career Services has undergone several changes in staffing, focus, and location. Prior to 2006, Career Services was located in the basement of the University’s main library, a location that was difficult for students to locate. Recognizing the demand for a visible and effective career center for both the alumni and current students, Career Services moved to an office space on the first floor of the Science Library, a location that has raised the visibility and amount of student contact. In 2004, Career Services had 961 appointments. This number has grown steadily to a high of 1,916 in the 2008-2009 academic years (Appendix 7.13). In addition, Career Services has expanded participation in the annual career fairs from approximately 60 to nearly 150 companies and, in direct response to student requests, is sponsoring a graduate school fair to include graduate programs from the region and across the nation.

The University should explore options to increase the recreational and late night opportunities available to students. To better align the University with its peer institutions and to meet minimum recreational standards for a university of its size, resources should be devoted to improving recreational opportunities on campus.
APPENDICES

7.1 Summary of Recommendations

With regard to the residential community:

UAlbany should move forward with the construction of additional housing on campus and continue to closely monitor the demand for on-campus housing.

With regard to students’ physical and mental well-being, UAlbany should:

- Take a closer look at the data made available through UAS, NACUFS and the ACUHO surveys, as there is evidence that despite significant progress in student/customer satisfaction with dining services, further improvements are needed

- Explore the possibility of implementing online appointment registration for students to schedule themselves for Health/Counseling appointments.

With regard to the services in support of the academic mission:

- Address accessibility issues of the many offices on the Lecture Center level (e.g. Advisement Services Center, Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Project Renaissance) which are less than suitable for students who have physical disabilities; a ramp or electric lift in the stairwell outside the Lecture Centers would provide access to ASC, EOP/Academic Support, the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Project Renaissance and the Lecture Centers.

- Since advisor caseloads at UAlbany are significantly higher than national averages, strategies should be considered to lower this ratio and/or to review alternative models designed to provide similar services; a reasonable assumption is that an advisor with fewer students can spend more time with each, and that additional time with advisors will contribute to more satisfied students, in turn contributing to stronger retention.

- Students receiving services from OASS appear to value the services provided, but there is need for empirical evidence of the impact of these services; OASS should be encouraged to develop an assessment plan to evaluate the impact of its services.

With regard to engagement in the life of the University and beyond:

- The University should explore options to increase the recreational and late night opportunities available to students.

- To better align UAlbany with its peer institutions and to meet minimum recreational standards for a university of our size, resources should be devoted to improving recreational opportunities on campus.
Appendix 7.2

To assist with UAlbany’s assessment efforts in the current round of re-accreditation, UAlbany’s Office of Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness conducted a survey of UAlbany undergraduate students between December 3rd and December 19th, 2008. Overall, 751 students participated in the survey, for a margin of error of +/- 3.5%. Results from this survey (referred to in this chapter as the “Re-accreditation Survey”) supplement results from the SUNY Student Opinion Surveys (SOS) conducted every three years since 1985 and most recently in spring of 2006 and 2009, as well as other topical assessment surveys conducted by offices included in this report.

- Student Success Annual Reports (AR) 2007 – 2008
- Student Success Assessment Reports
- Student Success Compact Plans
- Student Success Briefing Book 2008 – 2009
- Academic Support Services - [www.albany.edu/oass/](http://www.albany.edu/oass/)

Appendix 7.3 – Department of Residential Learning Outcomes

*By living in the Residence Halls, students will:*
- Demonstrate behaviors of mutual respect
- Positively contribute to their community
- Work to overcome challenges
- Display life skills
- Demonstrate habits that positively contribute to a sustainable environment
- Exhibit pride in the University at Albany

---

5 The re-accreditation survey results are available at [https://wiki.albany.edu/display/middlestates/Re-Accreditation+Survey+Results](https://wiki.albany.edu/display/middlestates/Re-Accreditation+Survey+Results). The survey was designed to address specific questions that various Self-Study Subcommittees needed additional information on in order to answer their charge questions. Accordingly, the survey results should not be interpreted as summative evaluations, in and of themselves, of particular issues, programs, or offices.
Appendix 7.4 – Residential Life: Overall Satisfaction

Overall Satisfaction with Residential Living

- 2001: 4.48
- 2002: 4.39
- 2004: 4.72
- 2006: 5.1
- 2008: 5.2
Appendix 7.5 – Residential Life: Occupancy & Satisfaction with Facilities

**Occupancy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>6645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Satisfaction with Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7.6 – University Health Center & Counseling Center Users

Appendix 7.7 – Health Center Satisfaction – Selected Findings

Appendix 7.8 – CARE Net Referrals
Appendix 7.9 – University Police Department Staffing
Appendix 7.10 – Students as Crime Victims

Crime Trends - On-Campus

Students as Crime Victims (July-June) - Off-Campus
Appendix 7.11 – Financial Aid Processed by the Financial Aid Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aid type</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stafford Loans</td>
<td>$44,618,783</td>
<td>$45,185,216</td>
<td>$47,677,709</td>
<td>$51,717,703</td>
<td>$53,603,272</td>
<td>$56,225,796</td>
<td>$60,379,681</td>
<td>$70,410,407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sub/unsub)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus Loans</td>
<td>$3,647,046</td>
<td>$3,785,126</td>
<td>$4,142,512</td>
<td>$6,225,034</td>
<td>$6,842,874</td>
<td>$8,683,210</td>
<td>$9,537,986</td>
<td>$7,673,341</td>
<td>$10,529,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Loans</td>
<td>$2,561,999</td>
<td>$2,635,170</td>
<td>$2,870,426</td>
<td>$2,538,552</td>
<td>$1,353,932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Loans</td>
<td>$7,312,650</td>
<td>$9,724,098</td>
<td>$11,535,674</td>
<td>$11,625,896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,142,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell Grant</td>
<td>$9,888,988</td>
<td>$9,899,776</td>
<td>$10,592,523</td>
<td>$11,959,575</td>
<td>$14,060,736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$499,500</td>
<td>$472,398</td>
<td>$556,434</td>
<td>$568,753</td>
<td>$552,302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$658,558</td>
<td>$661,869</td>
<td>$692,133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$298,639</td>
<td>$434,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP</td>
<td>$735,908</td>
<td>$724,700</td>
<td>$864,853</td>
<td>$978,879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,012,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,961,480</td>
<td>$12,814,129</td>
<td>$13,057,711</td>
<td>$14,298,406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>$95,439</td>
<td>$97,416</td>
<td>$100,100</td>
<td>$99,800</td>
<td>$97,016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APTS</td>
<td>$22,717</td>
<td>$32,295</td>
<td>$111,100</td>
<td>$8,373</td>
<td>$8,625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Tuition Sch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,201,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWSP</td>
<td>$973,701</td>
<td>$903,385</td>
<td>$957,525</td>
<td>$970,030</td>
<td>$942,925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td>$2,445,629</td>
<td>$2,778,328</td>
<td>$3,060,816</td>
<td>$3,485,518</td>
<td>$3,871,827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Scholarships</td>
<td>$1,983,227</td>
<td>$4,184,229</td>
<td>$4,480,658</td>
<td>$4,456,441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYS Scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td>$448,136</td>
<td>$418,103</td>
<td>$508,036</td>
<td>$648,394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSEU</td>
<td>$184,195</td>
<td>$270,396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$48,265,829</td>
<td>$48,970,342</td>
<td>$51,820,221</td>
<td>$56,252,911</td>
<td>$67,167,188</td>
<td>$109,110,059</td>
<td>$124,770,868</td>
<td>$129,158,254</td>
<td>$143,358,223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Financial Aid unit converted to the PeopleSoft system in 2005, but not all aid was posted and disbursed through the financial aid module until 2006 (2005-06 academic year). As a result, total aid disbursements are reflected in the table for 2006 onward.
## Appendix 7.12 – Advisement Services Center Student Learning Outcomes

### Student Responsibility
- Understand expectations as a student (go to classes, buy books, take good notes, study, converse with instructor, show up for exams)
- Learn UAlbany student tools: MyUAlbany; University email; Academic Calendar; terms such as AVN, Permission number, etc.
- Attend study groups and/or study skills workshops, if needed
- Ask for help when necessary
- Develop a relationship with professors and advisors and understand why this is important
- Advocate for self with professors and

### Understanding Degree Requirements
- Learn to read and interpret degree audit and Undergraduate Bulletin
- Learn to build a class schedule that meets your needs
- Learn to use GPA calculator
- Develop a timetable for academic plan
- Understand how transfer coursework/exams effect one’s degree (Same for summer coursework)

### Awareness of Academic and Co-curricular Opportunities
- Gather information about: academic opportunities (e.g., majors, minors, internships, study abroad, independent study, and research)
- Co-curricular opportunities (e.g., clubs, student organizations, honor societies, and leadership activities)
- Other University resources (e.g., mentors, academic support, Counseling Center, Financial Aid, and Disabled Student Services)

### Intellectual Development
- Be able to articulate why one is here (in college and UAlbany)
- Identify areas of interest and of strength
- Understand the purpose of General Education Program and a liberal arts education
- Develop an understanding of amounts and types of studying required in college
- Choose a major and minor
- Understand reasons for choosing major/academic path
- Reflect on the pros and cons of one’s approach to education
- Master study skills
- Consider applicable honors programs

### Careers and Opportunities
- Identify long term goals and reexamine/update them over time
- Understand that majors do not limit career options
- Reflect on how undergraduate career affects long term personal and professional goals
- Identify and gather information about opportunities such as combined bachelor’s/master’s programs, and graduate schools
- Utilize services of Career Development Center
University offices
• Acquire pertinent academic information independently
• Follow up on referrals
• Participate in activities within academic discipline
• Serve as a positive student role model

• Develop intellectual curiosity
• Seek out academic challenges
• Increase acceptance of diverse people and ideas
• Develop critical skills such as reflection, synthesizing, and open-mindedness
Appendix 7.13 – Restorative Justice

![Number of Restorative Cases (UCAB)](image)

Appendix 7.14 – Career Services Users

![Career Counseling Appointments](image)
Chapter 8: Faculty

Overview

Perhaps no factor is as important to the success of a major research university as the quality of its faculty. In the broadest sense, quality includes excellence in research, teaching, and service. In fact, these characteristics are the key elements of the appointment, promotion, and continuing appointment processes. Furthermore, University at Albany faculty must act as agents of change, promoting the institution’s core values of diversity and academic freedom. This chapter explores various aspects of how the University appoints, recruits and retains high-caliber faculty; it examines the current full-time/part-time faculty mix and covers faculty issues linked to UAlbany’s mission, including diversity and academic freedom. The chapter also discusses how the University supports its faculty and measures their productivity in research and teaching. Included are discussions on faculty support for protection against classroom violence, and faculty involvement with community engagement. It is well recognized that all of these considerations must undergo continuing scrutiny and be part of an environment that searches for approaches so as to better evaluate and improve faculty practices.

The Mission Statement (Appendix 8.2) reinforces UAlbany’s identity as “a modern and complex public research university,” and, as with peer institutions, it is necessary to coordinate full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and graduate teaching and research assistants to achieve institutional goals.

Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

As an accredited institution, the University at Albany possesses and demonstrates fair and impartial practices in the hiring, evaluation, and dismissal of its teaching faculty. The practices, procedures, rights and protections are identified in such documents as: The Policies of the Board of Trustees (BOT), The Agreement between the State of New York and United University Professions (UUP), The Agreement between the State of New York and the Graduate Student Employees Union (GSEU), and The Guidelines for the Appointment of Part-time Faculty Members. Upon initial appointment, all faculty members, whether full or part-time, receive hard copies of the Policies of the Board of Trustees and the UUP Contract. They are also available online. The guidelines for part-time faculty were formulated approximately three years ago and are reviewed and revised annually.¹

Appointment, promotion and tenure guidelines are well documented in the Faculty Handbook and are consistent with BOT and UUP requirements. Individual tenure and promotion cases must be developed on a timeline consistent with these requirements. There are many levels of evaluation, usually including involvement by departments and colleges as well as internal committees on research, teaching, and service. External reviews, usually from leading academic experts with little or no personal connection to the candidate, are obtained and considered as

¹ [http://www.albany.edu/academic_affairs/policies_guidelines/part-time_faculty.html](http://www.albany.edu/academic_affairs/policies_guidelines/part-time_faculty.html)
critical parts of each case. Teaching is evaluated through a variety of means, including Student Instructional Rating Form (SIRF) scores, grade distributions, classroom visits and written comments. Minutes of all meetings relating to each case as well as the outcomes of any votes are also retained and included. Thus, when cases reach the University-wide Council for Promotion and Continuing Appointment (CPCA) they have a clear paper which includes the sequence of steps that brought them there. Once voted on, they proceed to the provost, to the president, and eventually to the SUNY Chancellor for approval. Candidates are made aware of the outcomes of the various deliberations. In general more than 40 cases per year are processed by CPCA. While the various levels of faculty governance vote and provide specific recommendations, final decisions on each case are made by the administration. Departmental reviews at contract-renewal point provide feedback to faculty, signaling the faculty member’s potential success for continued appointment. No significant objections have been made in any recent cases that have required the implementation of detailed grievance procedures, although such procedures exist. For details of the procedures see the Faculty Handbook.

The effectiveness of appointment and promotion procedures in maintaining a high caliber faculty is demonstrated by program areas that meet the standards of the American Library Association; Committee on Accreditation of the American Psychological Association; Committee on Accreditation of the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs; Council on Education for Public Health; Council on Social Work Education; National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration; Commission on Peer Review and Accreditation, Planning Accreditation Board; and the Teacher Education Accreditation Council.

Recruitment

The University at Albany believes that to be a leading research university, it must recruit individuals who have achieved or have the clear potential to achieve national prominence. Such faculty are highly active in research, effective in the classroom, and influential in the intellectual development and direction of their respective fields. These scholars are highly competitive in the national market at all stages of their careers.

In recent years, faculty recruitments have mirrored the general budget situation and the level of resources allocated to strategic priorities. While there are fluctuations from year to year in hiring numbers, on average UAlbany hired 31 new academic faculty per year from 2000-2008. In academic years 2008-09 and 2009-10, however, hires have dropped precipitously, with 22 new faculty being hired in 2008-09 and only 16 in 2009-10, as of this writing.

Faculty at the University are recruited by individual departments. The resources to support them come from departmental, school or college, and University-wide levels. Annual recruitment plans are prepared at the school or college level with the leadership of the deans, who are responsible for balancing commitments to graduate and undergraduate education as well as department or college-level program priorities and University-wide goals. Typical recruitment practices include outreach through professional societies and personal networks, customized start-up packages (e.g., equipment, summer salary, assignment of graduate assistants), flexibility in stopping or expediting tenure clocks, and the possibility of reduced initial teaching load.
Retention practices include counteroffers, sabbaticals and education leaves, allocation of graduate and teaching assistants, assignment of senior faculty mentors, course buyouts, and some targeted facility investments.

The UAlbany Faculty/Staff Re-Accreditation Survey (December 2008) sheds some light on the effectiveness of these practices and suggests some areas for greater attention. Just over one-third of faculty respondents (37%) reported that their departments typically make one offer, 45% reported making two offers, and 18% reported making three or more offers for a single position. This pattern, combined with the rate of failed or extended searches noted above, may indicate that recruitment efforts are attracting top level candidates who have several offers to choose from. However, they also suggest that the University is not as successful as it would like to be at winning the most desirable candidates.

Loss of high-caliber faculty, either at recruitment or later in their careers, often involves inability to compete with other institutions’ compensation packages, offers from more prestigious institutions, or competition from institutions or programs making significant investments in a program or field. The top five reasons why candidates declined offers were reported as: the University’s or an individual department’s reputation compared to that of other universities (30% combined), inadequate provision for a spouse or partner (28%), inadequate salary (22%), location (17%), and insufficient support for research or for set-ups and support packages (13% each).

Current faculty reported their own reasons for accepting a position at the University as opportunity to pursue research interests (49%), location (47%), reputation of their departments (30%), number of colleagues with shared interests (27%), and teaching load and support for research (each at 21%). A number of respondents noted that their decisions to join the faculty were made some years ago; however, these response patterns hold true for faculty hired within the last five years, between five and 14 years ago, and 15 or more years ago. Across all faculty types, regardless of years since their appointments, the top two reasons for accepting a position were opportunity to pursue research interests and location (each chosen by about half of the respondents). Support for research, number of colleagues with shared interests, and reputation of the department were also frequently given as reasons for accepting an offer (chosen by about one-third of respondents). The least mentioned reasons (about 10%) were quality of students, provision for a trailing spouse or partner, and reputation of the University.

In terms of the overall professional environment for faculty, respondents rated 18 factors on a 5-point satisfaction scale. These addressed teaching, research, administration, support, faculty development and other topics. The three top-rated factors were academic freedom (88% satisfied or very satisfied), graduate class size (69% satisfied or very satisfied), and collegiality (67% satisfied or very satisfied). The three lowest rated factors were support for travel, conferences, and journals (23% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied), quality of physical infrastructure (30% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied), and quality of undergraduates (30% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied). These low-rated items, along with support for research, were also most often rated somewhat worse or much worse than at other institutions where faculty have held positions.

As discussed below, a survey conducted over the period of the self-study questioned voting faculty on their perceptions of the extent to which different units had fulfilled their functions.
effectively. The following are the summary evaluative ratings, by faculty expressing their views on: the SUNY Board of Trustees (36% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied); University Council (16% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied); University Administration (27% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied); and University Senate (18% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied). The faculty survey reported the following average levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, by faculty expressing views, with various support services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support Services</td>
<td>53% satisfied or very satisfied and 12% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisement Services Center</td>
<td>51% satisfied or very satisfied and 20% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Services</td>
<td>51% satisfied or very satisfied and 15% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Counseling Center</td>
<td>61% satisfied or very satisfied and 5% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Resources Center</td>
<td>71% satisfied or very satisfied and 5% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Health Center</td>
<td>57% satisfied or very satisfied and 8% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Registrar</td>
<td>70% satisfied or very satisfied and 8% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>64% satisfied or very satisfied and 9% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, open-ended responses emphasized a lack of all sorts of infrastructure (including physical, administrative, technical, library, and staff support) as hindering factors. Faculty frequently cited individual commitment, interest among colleagues, and feedback from students as motivating factors for pursuing new work or ways of working or teaching. Some said they were not actively discouraged from innovative initiatives, but they received little support or positive institutional feedback for pursuing them.

The findings of the UAlbany Re-Accreditation Survey are generally consistent with the results of the 2005-06 Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey of pre-tenure and tenure-track faculty. In that survey, the features rated “best” about UAlbany centered around the institution being “fit,” location, and support and quality of colleagues (the last two were especially important for women and minority faculty). The qualities rated “worst” included lack of support for research, too many service assignments, and the quality of students, particularly undergraduates. Mean scores on many specific elements of the survey were in the range of good to very good. Nevertheless, young faculty generally rated the University below the
average of peer institutions for the nature of work (represented by the number and quality of students; academic, administrative and technical support, and facilities); policies and practices (such as mentoring, spousal/partner employment support, limits on administrative load, and work-life balance); climate, culture and collegiality (such as interaction with senior colleagues and a sense of unity and cohesion in departments and schools); and overall satisfaction with the University and department as a place to work. In response to some of these concerns, the provost hired a special assistant for faculty and program development. On the positive side, younger UAlbany faculty rated the tenure process more highly than did young faculty at peer institutions.

These findings suggest several possible recommendations.

- First, building upon the positive responses gathered in the UAlbany Re-Accreditation Survey, the University should place much greater emphasis on its inherent strengths when recruiting faculty. A “view book” for prospective faculty should be prepared in both print and Web form. It should present institutional and faculty profiles, highlights of key research programs, high national rankings, and nationally recognized individuals.
- Location was cited as both a positive and negative in recent surveys. For the many who find Albany a good location, the view book (and individual recruitment efforts) should place more emphasis on the benefits of being in the state capital, the relatively low cost of living, good educational and housing options, and so on.
- A supportive environment for women and minorities comes through in the various surveys and this should be highlighted when recruiting new faculty.
- The Honors College and Presidential Scholars should be promoted as examples of top notch students.
- University-wide recruitment materials should be complemented and supplemented by the schools and departments. At the school and department levels, recruits and current faculty value the quality and collegiality of departments and research groups. Accordingly, nationally ranked programs should be detailed and highlighted in recruiting material, for both faculty and graduate students.
- Greater investment in personal mentoring and development of all junior faculty, but especially those in highly competitive fields, should also be made a priority. This should become a conscious effort led by deans and department chairs, and emphasized during recruitment as one way in which new faculty are supported through their early careers and tenure decisions. At the institutional level, considerations should be given to faculty-oriented services and activities, such as symposia, faculty orientation sessions, and social or cultural events.
- Investment is needed in support for faculty research across more disciplines. Low ratings of infrastructure and support services indicate areas where both targeted and general investments are needed in the number, quality, and availability of support personnel and in supportive technical, laboratory and other research infrastructure. The research support structures further described in the University Support for Faculty section do not reach everyone.
General Faculty Profile

Teaching, research, and public service at UAlbany is carried out by a group of employees consisting of full-time tenure track faculty, full-time non-tenure track faculty (i.e., contingent), part-time contingent adjuncts, and graduate students who serve as research assistants, teaching assistants, and instructors of record for classes.

Full-Time Faculty Appointments

When UAlbany began drafting its last self-study in 1998, the University employed 546 full-time faculty in the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and lecturer. In 2008 it employed 658 full-time faculty with net gains at the ranks of assistant professor and lecturer (Appendix Tables 8.3). In addition, the University employed 33 full-time librarians; under SUNY Board of Trustees policies, librarians are part of the full-time faculty. Assuming adequate attention to retention, the net gain of appointments at the rank of assistant professor will reinvigorate the pipeline of tenure-track faculty that was severely curtailed in 1998. There has also been a 24% increase since 1990 in full-time qualified positions (non-tenure-track). While the contraction of the University’s full-time faculty reflected available resources, the re-growth of full-time faculty numbers reflected not only resource availability but also structural change.

Faculty appointments reflecting structural changes emphasizing research can best be seen by viewing the distribution of full-time and part-time faculty by school and college (Table 8.4). In the period from 1999 to 2008, the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering (CNSE) was established, the School of Public Health has grown substantially, and the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) full-time faculty headcount continued to decline, in part because its Department of Computer Science was moved to the College of Computing and Information.

Faculty Utilization and Workload: Research and Teaching

The University endeavors to ensure an equitable workload accommodating the demands of research and teaching, along with academic service. Involvement in graduate education and research activity is considered when teaching loads are considered. Faculty complete annual Faculty Activity Reports, which are reviewed by deans.

The enhanced emphasis on research is reflected in part in external funding. While external funding is not an adequate measure for research productivity in all fields, total dollars of external research funding handled by the University at Albany Research Foundation nearly doubled from $70.3 million in Fiscal Year 2001-2002 to $138.8 million in Fiscal Year 2006-2007, and external funding through Health Research Incorporated for School of Public Health faculty reached $97.6 million (Table 8.5). The rapid increase in external funding, including corporate and government investments in a $4.5 billion research complex (Albany NanoTech), under the aegis of the CNSE, provides the University with external recognition as a rising research institution.

While the School of Public Health has established an undergraduate major and CNSE is in the process of establishing an undergraduate major, neither of these schools will likely alter the
substantial teaching workload of CAS, which provides the general education requirements for undergraduates. The teaching workload in CAS exceeded 10,000 annual average student full-time equivalents (FTE) in the past two years.\(^2\)

In addition to shifts in full-time faculty between schools and colleges, the type of faculty present in the classroom is changing. From fall 2003 to fall 2008, the percentage of student FTE taught by full-time, tenure-track faculty diminished from 54.3\% to 44.5\%, while the percentage of student FTE taught by administrators and part-time faculty rose from 22.4\% to 30.9\% (Table 8.6). The percentage of student FTE taught by graduate student instructors and non-tenure-track, full-time faculty remained approximately stable over the same period.

**Faculty Utilization and Workload: Academic Service**

Academic service is an obligation of all faculty, along with teaching and research. It constitutes a separate area of faculty workload and is a consideration in tenure and promotion decisions. Service activities have been difficult to quantify because prior to 2009 information was not collected in a form amenable to analysis. Service to the University through faculty governance falls almost exclusively to full-time faculty as part-time faculty do not have voting rights in the Faculty Senate.

**Compensation**

Compensation packages for UAlbany full-time faculty on 9/10 contracts are generally competitive in relation to other SUNY Research Centers (Table 8.7).

Compensation and workload are the major issues surrounding contingent (non-tenure track) appointments because of concern for ensuring consistent and equitable practices across the University. For full-time contingent faculty the UUP agreement stipulates the minimum salary based upon title (e.g., effective 9/1/08, minimum salary for a full-time lecturer or visiting assistant professor $35,201). There is no such contractual provision for part-time adjunct faculty and, as such, departments can determine per course rates based upon recruitment/market need. Beginning in the fall 2006, the University established a minimum per course rate of $2,800 for a three-credit course taught by part-time adjunct faculty. Departments are able to pay above this rate if their particular market requires such salary. Departments can only pay below this minimum for a course that is less than 3 credits, team taught, or where other special circumstances apply. There has been no evidence of classes not covered or cancelled as a result of difficulties in recruiting contingent faculty. It is unclear if the availability and increase in the number of part-time faculty is in part connected to the establishment of a minimum stipend for teaching a 3-credit course. Under the terms and conditions of the GSEU contract, teaching assistants in the 2008-09 academic year who were employed on a full-time basis (i.e., 20 hours/week) had a guaranteed minimum stipend of $8,093 for the full academic year.

\(^{2}\) For more details on student FTE see [http://web.albany.edu/ir/Profiles/ourUAlbanyData/ualbany_data/UAlbanyIRProfiles/IRProfiles_front.htm](http://web.albany.edu/ir/Profiles/ourUAlbanyData/ualbany_data/UAlbanyIRProfiles/IRProfiles_front.htm)
Discretionary Salary Increase Process

Both tenure-track and contingent faculty are eligible for discretionary increases regardless of their full-time/part-time status. Under the terms and conditions of the agreement between the State of New York and the United University Professions, a pool of money equal to one percent of the total salaries of UUP staff is provided to the campus. The purpose of this “discretionary fund” is to address salary compression and equity issues as well as to recognize merit.

Discretionary increases based on compression and equity address persons whose salary is judged to be inequitable compared to that of others with comparable accomplishments, length of service, and value to the institution. Increases based on merit recognize outstanding performance appropriate to the individual position — contributions clearly beyond the high level of performance expected of all members of the University professional staff. These salary increases are above and beyond the across-the-board raises provided to all members of the bargaining unit. Not every employee receives a discretionary award in any given year.

The pool of money for discretionary increases is distributed proportionately (based upon employee FTE) across all divisions within the University. Each vice president has the discretion to assign an allocation to each dean or director within that division. The dean/director may then make award recommendations for deserving staff in the amount of no less than $500 and no greater than $3,000 for full-time staff. Part-time staff increases are limited proportionately to their individual percentage obligation. The vice presidents make recommendations for their divisions to the president for final approval. Individuals not recommended for discretionary awards in a given year have appeal/review rights.

Appointment and Workload Outcomes: Research and Teaching

As part of the Mission Review II process as documented in the Memorandum of Understanding between the University at Albany and the State University of New York, the University prepared an extensive peer analysis to compare institutional metrics, including faculty and teaching, to national benchmarks. Among peers, the University ranked the lowest in percentage of full-time faculty — at 63.7% of total faculty headcount — while maintaining a respectable 84% first-year retention rate and 65.8 % six-year graduation rate of first-time full-time undergraduate students (Tables 8.8A and 8.8B). Only two institutions in UAlbany’s peer groups, Stony Brook University and University at California, Irvine, have a higher percentage of undergraduate sections with 50 or more students; larger class sizes may impact the quality of the undergraduate student experience by inhibiting class participation. Large class sizes also make it more difficult for instructors to write personalized letters of recommendation, and heavy reliance on part-time instructors makes it more difficult for students to select three members of the full-time faculty to write such letters.

In the University at Albany’s 2005 Periodic Review Report (p.4), particular concern was expressed by the external reviewers regarding the use of part-time and contingent faculty relative to having more full-time faculty. Strategies to improve and enhance the level of permanent full-time faculty were announced in 2005 with President Kermit Hall’s commitment to 20 additional full-time faculty per year for the next five years, or a total of 100 new faculty by 2010-2011.
Although the 2005 strategic plan was not formally implemented after President Hall’s death, the data in Appendix Table 8.9 show an average increase of 20 full-time faculty per year for 2005, 2006 and 2007. Table 8.9 also shows that the part-time staff increased an average of eight employees per year for the last nine years and an average of 15 since 2006, when a $2,800 per course minimum was implemented. It is evident that part-time faculty are effective in their teaching, since the undergraduate retention and graduate rates show UAlbany performing as well or better than some of its current peers. At the same time the University will need to determine if increasing the full-time to part-time ratio could help it reach the instructional metrics of its aspirational peers going forward. The 2009 campus Budget Advisory Group issued a report to address current economic issues, emphasizing the need to preserve and promote the University’s core mission with direct funds. The report also emphasizes the need to achieve an optimal balance of full-time versus part-time faculty, especially for undergraduate education.

The emphasis on placing new appointments in the School of Public Health and CNSE has been successful in increasing the University’s research profile nationally, as well as in relation to its peers. In 2005 the University was ranked 63rd in total research expenditures by the National Science Foundation (NSF); additional peer-analysis of UAlbany faculty research is presented in the Productivity Measures section, below.

**Contingent Faculty: Non-tenure Track Issues**

Job security (renewal/nonrenewal) decisions for contingent faculty are based upon the needs of the academic program, the performance of the appointee, and available resources (e.g., funding, enrollments). Beginning in fall 2006, departments have been encouraged to make full-year appointments for part-time lecturers whenever possible. The University also seeks to provide, where possible, a two-course teaching assignment each semester for adjuncts, so that they can receive health benefits. Figures in Table 8.9 demonstrate that although the number of part-time faculty has increased, the institution has not been successful in increasing the number of full-year appointments. In fact, in the first two years, there was a 14% decrease in the number of full-year assignments compared to a 12% overall total part-time staff increase. In 2008-2009 the status quo was maintained in full-year assignments, with a 27% overall increase in part-time staff.

The UAlbany Faculty/Staff Re-Accreditation Survey (December 2008) gathered data on contingent employees’ views with respect to recruitment, environmental climate and teaching. The open-ended comments suggest that this population does not receive sufficient communication with respect to policies and procedures.

In addition to full-year appointments, the departments have been encouraged to utilize a portion of their annual discretionary increases to acknowledge excellence in performance of duties for the contingent faculty. Insofar as possible, the procedures for evaluation of part-time faculty parallel those used for full-time faculty and, at a minimum, include provision for student course evaluations and review of course syllabi and related materials. These assessments are then used in the annual discretionary salary process to award salary increases based upon meritorious performance. Table 8.10 reveals no relation between total discretionary awards and numbers of contingent faculty recipients.
Graduate Research and Teaching Assistants Issues

The utilization and workload of graduate teaching assistants and research assistants are relevant to the discussion of how the University delivers its programs, how it provides an avenue for training the next generation of instructors and researchers, and how it protects its graduate student population from overuse. The University has formal and explicit guidelines governing appointment procedures and workload requirements of graduate assistants; these guidelines are widely disseminated, available through the Graduate Studies Website and include information about: UAlbany graduate assistantships; fellowships and tuition scholarships; guidelines for departments; and additional guidelines for students. Full graduate assistantships (0.5 FTE) have teaching assignments of up to five credits, laboratory teaching assignments of two or three sections per session, or non-teaching assignments of 15 – 20 clock hours per week. The Communications Workers of America Local 1104/Graduate Student Employees Union (CWA Local 1104/GSEU) represents UAlbany graduate and teaching assistants for the purposes of collective bargaining negotiations. Course and section analysis data posted on the publicly available Electronic Departmental Profiles of Enrollment and Enrollment Related Information show that at the campus level, teaching assistants represented 11% of the instructors of record over the three fall terms of 2004-2007; that percentage was stable over time. When doctoral-level degree recipients are grouped into cohorts by their year of graduation, the past five graduating cohorts had an overall mean time-to-degree of seven years (Table 8.11). A major policy bearing on time-to-degree is the stipulation that doctoral students who enter the University without advanced standing are limited to a total of four years of state-funded support as graduate or teaching assistants. Procedures in current use to support that policy include asking departments to provide the length of state support when requesting graduate assistant and teaching assistant renewals. In addition, the information concerning years of support is sometimes verified through electronic records prior to granting a graduate assistant continuing appointment. Doctoral students who have passed their entrance to candidacy and who have been consistently funded by their departments may also be eligible for an additional year of funding to support dissertation writing.

Recommendations

- Full-time, part-time, and graduate teaching assistant instructors are likely to remain a feature of UAlbany classrooms in the next 10 years. While increasing full-time faculty may not be immediately possible, aligning new appointments to support core missions and determining an optimum full-time/part-time mix for faculty will benefit from broad-based input. If the mission statement of the University is revised, realigning faculty activities to support the revised institutional goals will be necessary. UAlbany should develop better institutional data systems, with linkages between instructor employment status and student outcome and assessment data, and continue to encourage full-year appointments of contingent faculty whenever possible, while acknowledging that budgetary constraints may impact a department’s ability to do so; In conjunction with the recommendation in the Going Forward Plan, Section B.1, on supporting faculty and staff, which suggests establishing a faculty taskforce, further charge this taskforce to develop policies and procedures clearly linking the number of contingent faculty with the number of contingent faculty receiving discretionary salary increases to show consistent
rewarding of meritorious service for the faculty; and establish an annual orientation specifically for contingent faculty, both new and returning.

- The University should implement the recommendations in the *Going Forward Plan*, Section B.2, on supporting faculty and staff; they provide for a University-wide directive stipulating that service counts toward tenure and promotion, and clarifying service expectations both for junior faculty and for faculty who have received tenure.

### Diversity

The University has two key goals with respect to diversity: 1) to “provide its employees and applicants for employment a discrimination-free work environment; and 2) to have a “representative workforce.” The University strives to achieve and maintain these goals by promoting an environment of fairness, tolerance, inclusion, justice and interdependence. Further, every member of the campus community is expected to understand, respect and take responsibility for the achievement and maintenance of these principles. Faculty and students have continued to make diversity issues matters of academic inquiry, with course offerings and research in the School of Social Welfare, the departments of Africana Studies, Latin American, and Caribbean & U. S. Latino Studies, and Women’s Studies, as well as such associated research centers as the Center for the Elimination of Minority Health Disparities.

The steps taken by the University toward achieving this end included setting up the: (i) Office of Diversity and Affirmative Action (ODAA); and (ii) the University Commission on Diversity and Affirmative Action (UCDAA). The ODAA, initially set up in the 1980s as part of a state initiative and having undergone several transformations, implements the policies for assuring UAlbany’s goals with respect to diversity. In particular, ODAA ensures that every unit on campus strictly adheres to the guidelines for recruiting faculty from diverse pools.  

Further, these guidelines are reviewed systematically, with administrators and faculty offered training in their implementation. The UCDAA, set up in the 1970s, is a broader group represented by all the constituents of the University, including students, administrative staff and faculty. It is assigned the task of keeping the campus community updated and informed on all diversity issues; it also ensures a system of checks and balances.  

In recent years, a less formal forum, the Organization for Women Faculty, has emerged on campus as the social platform for the exchange of ideas, the mentoring of junior women faculty, the provision of academic and non-academic support to peers, etc.

As a result of these efforts by the University community, the campus has seen positive trends with respect to diversity within the faculty group (Table 8.12). Comparing 2008 to 2000 in 10 categories for which data on full-time faculty distribution by gender are available, UAlbany had a higher percentage of women faculty in all but two categories: the ranks of full professor and associate professor. Similarly, comparing the percentage of part-time women faculty between 2000 and 2008 over the 10 reported categories (Table 8.13), the University has shown an increase in all but two ranks: assistant professor and lecturer. In sum, the University’s efforts in

---

3 The current guidelines are available at [http://www.albany.edu/affirmative_action/hiring.html](http://www.albany.edu/affirmative_action/hiring.html).

recruiting and retaining women faculty in both full-time and part-time positions show advancement.

A similar analysis of the trend over the nine-year period beginning in 2000 for faculty diversity by race reveals some interesting facts (Table 8.14, for full-time faculty by rank; Table 8.15, for part-time faculty by rank). For full-time faculty, across the 10 categories and ranks reported, white faculty have declined in nine — the exception is “Associate Librarian.” In most of the categories, other races, non-resident aliens (NRAs), and the “unknown” category have increased. However, it may be noted that African-American faculty have not increased, except in the rank of “Associate Professor.” With respect to part-time faculty, except for the ranks of professor and librarian, again, white faculty have either remained steady or declined in percentage terms while Asian Americans have increased in two categories, and NRAs and Hispanics in one each. African Americans have remained unchanged in most cases and declined in one category. In sum, while UAlbany’s faculty has become more diverse by race in general, efforts could focus more on recruiting and retaining African-American and Hispanic faculty.

When analyzing the University at Albany’s data with respect to current and aspirational peers, based on the data available for a mid-point year of the trend analysis, i.e., 2005 (Table 8.16), the University compares favorably with both its current and aspirational peers in the recruiting and retaining of African-American full-time faculty. It also fares well with respect to aspirational peers for African-American participation in administrative and professional positions, but does not fare too well with respect to other categories of diversity. In sum, when compared to its peers, the University fares well in some categories but has room for improvement in others.

Recommendations

- Looking ahead, the University could facilitate diversity even further by continuing to move beyond a simple awareness of diversity and build upon the work of the 2008 Diversity Task Force. Actions that will facilitate moving to the next level include: holding anti-racism seminars across campus, establishing inter-group dialogues and guest speaker series; deliberately addressing the more difficult issues of race, and most importantly, maintaining a sustained dialogue on the issue of diversity on campus.

Academic Freedom and Integrity

Academic freedom specifics can be found in the Faculty Handbook and the Board of Trustees Policies and apply to all faculty regardless of FTE or tenure/non-tenure track. Excerpts from Senate and Council minutes provide substantial evidence that policies are in place and that the faculty is actively engaged in issues of academic freedom and freedom of expression.

The process for grievance is provided by the Committee on Academic Freedom, and Freedom of Information, and Community Responsibility (CAFFECoR), formerly known as the Council on Academic Freedom and Ethics (CAFÉ). An informal interview with the current CAFFECoR chair indicated there have been no grievances brought to CAFE or CAFFECoR for several years.
Provisions are in place to ensure commitment to principles of protecting intellectual property rights as specified in the Senate Handbook. Regulations regarding the patent or copyright of inventions made by persons working in University facilities are detailed in Article XI, Title J of The Policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees and at UAlbany’s Office for Technology Development. The University Libraries regularly provides presentations for faculty on the use of copyright-protected materials in teaching and research, and each semester and during the summer, the copyright education librarian presents seminars for faculty on scholarly author rights.

University Support of Faculty

Research and Scholarship

The University provides comprehensive support to faculty, primarily through the provision of institutional services under the umbrella of the Division for Research, seed funding and leave programs, and the appointment and allocation of graduate research assistants or departmental assistance. In fact, a survey of faculty, staff and students conducted by the Office of Institutional Research in December 2008 revealed that “opportunity to pursue research interests” (49%) and “support for research” (21%) were selected by faculty as prime factors in deciding to take a position at UAlbany — the former receiving the highest rating among all factors.

Similar to UAlbany’s peer institutions, research support services are provided through an administrative infrastructure charged with a wide range of responsibilities, from information technology consultation and grant proposal development to post-award services. Administration of grants from external sources is handled by the Research Foundation. According to the University at Albany Faculty Handbook, “the Research Foundation of SUNY is a non-profit, educational corporation, which is chartered by the Board of Trustees of SUNY to serve as trustee and fiscal administrator for all gift, grant, and contract funds supporting sponsored research, training, and related programs carried out or supervised by State University faculty members.”

In addition to the administrative services of the Research Foundation, the Office of the Vice President for Research offers special grant and fellowship programs including the Faculty Research Awards Program (FRAP) and Journal/Conference Support. Faculty are encouraged to apply for FRAP Awards, which provide funds in partial support of faculty research and other creative activities. These funds are considered catalyzing agents for stimulating research and scholarly endeavors and as seed funding for projects having the potential for subsequent external support. In Category A, awards of between $4,000 and $10,000 are made to support substantial research projects with a strong possibility for future external funding; applications are judged at the University level. In Category B, awards of $1,000 to $4,000 are made to support more modest research and scholarly activities; applications are evaluated within the applicant’s college or school.

5 [http://www.albany.edu/senate/handbook/section1.html](http://www.albany.edu/senate/handbook/section1.html)
6 [http://www.suny.edu/Board_of_Trustees/index.cfm](http://www.suny.edu/Board_of_Trustees/index.cfm)
7 [http://www.albany.edu/research/TechDevPolicies.htm](http://www.albany.edu/research/TechDevPolicies.htm)
The campus Journal and Conference Support Awards provide grants to assist faculty who have been selected by peers to edit professional journals. Funds are also allocated annually to support research conferences. A Research Foundation/SUNY Equipment Matching Program matches, dollar for dollar, external funds raised for equipment purchases and renovation costs.

The University’s policies and practices for awarding sabbatical and other research leaves are also critical for promoting and assisting faculty development. Additional important support is provided annually through small grant programs for faculty research and involvement in journal editing and conference sponsorship through the Office of Research. State funds support the union-negotiated benefit of the widely publicized Drescher Leave Program as well as Individual Development Awards (more information is included in section on Recognition of Faculty).

The Division for Research and the Office for Sponsored Programs offer proposal writing resources and training. Among these is the periodic “New Investigators Orientation;” another was the “NIH and You – An Overview of Program Funding and Grants Administration” conference held in 2008 to assist investigators and their administrators in identifying funding opportunities, understanding and preparing successful NIH applications, and managing awards. Support is also available from the Research IT Group, formed in 2004 by the Office of the CIO and Division for Research to provide information technology consultation to faculty in the grant development process and to develop core services in support of research. The schools and colleges also offer these kinds of assistance.

Faculty may work directly or through departmental channels with the Research office’s administrative offices or collaborate with one of the University’s many organized research units (centers, institutes, labs), which often provide comprehensive pre-award and post-award services to faculty and grant-seekers. As stated in the preface to the Office for Research’s Directory of Organized Research Units and Specialized Facilities, “…the centers and institutes listed in this volume assist faculty, students and community professionals in advancing knowledge, conducting interdisciplinary research and promoting professional growth within and across individual fields. The faculty affiliated with these centers and institutes provide an increasingly significant portion of the campus’ intellectual vitality and external funding.”

Leave programs, such as sabbaticals and research leaves, provide another venue of research support for UAlbany faculty. Eligibility criteria for sabbatical leave are included within the Policies of the Board of Trustees and the agreement between the State of New York and the United University Professions, Inc. and are more specifically articulated and defined procedurally in the University at Albany Policy Statement on Sabbatical Leaves: the benefit provides paid leave for the purposes of “planned travel, study, formal education, research, writing or other experience of professional value.”

In addition to overseeing research activity at the University, the Office for Research maintains data on internally and externally funded research (Tables 8.17 and 8.5). How does the University compare with its peer institutions in some of these important areas? In 2005 UAlbany was ranked 63rd by the NSF in total research expenditures. Based on NSF/Division of Science Resources Statistics, Survey of Research and Development Expenditures at Universities and Colleges, FY 2007, the University ranked 15 out of 20 institutions without a medical school
reporting the largest academic R&D expenditures in 2007. IPEDS data indicate that within both current and aspirational peer groups UAlbany reports the second highest expenditures in the area of research support/FT Faculty. In terms of overall ability to attract research funds the University continues to stay competitive with its current peers, and keeps up with several aspirational peers in R&D expenditures, but falls short in faculty scholarship. It may be fair to say that while improvements and efficiencies should be a goal, some of the University’s success in attracting R&D can be attributed to the support structure and opportunities currently in place.

Recommendations

- The administrative infrastructure, seed funds, and provision of research assistants are essential elements of a research-oriented institution. However, a survey of faculty and notes from the Going Forward Plan effort suggests improvements, including: create a Center for Research; provide an incentive plan or structure for increasing quality research, additional funding, opportunities for collaboration and training; improvements/investments in IT; and improve the showcasing of faculty research. Several of these suggestions seem possible with modest financial investment and enhancement of resources currently in place.

Teaching

The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) was established in 1994 to assist faculty development and innovation in curricular design. In 2007, CETL became the Institute for Teaching, Learning and Academic Leadership (ITLAL), as it refocused and redefined its mission to better serve the faculty and teaching staff through programs of instructional, curricular, and faculty development. Activities include consultation services (one-on-one and group), training and workshops in such areas as dynamic classroom teaching, teaching portfolios, team-based learning, course syllabus design, and more. These services are offered to all faculty and teaching assistants. ITLAL also provides small grants for instruction and faculty development, and assists in Website and online course development.  

Campus and SUNY-level awards for excellence are discussed in detail below.

Recognition

Each year, the University president and provost solicit nominations for the Excellence Awards in Teaching, Research, and Service. The Council of Research encourages both junior and senior faculty to apply for excellence in research awards. (A list of excellence award recipients since 1996 is available at [http://www.albany.edu/president/excellence_awards.shtml](http://www.albany.edu/president/excellence_awards.shtml).) These awards are given at the campus level as well as the SUNY wide system level. In addition to these awards, faculty are eligible to be considered for promotion to the ranks of Distinguished Professor, Distinguished Teaching Professor, and Distinguished Service Professor. In 2006 the University established its first endowed professorships, awarded to two top researchers in atmospheric science and chemistry (press release at

8 For more information see [http://www.albany.edu/teachingandlearning/directors_welcome.shtml](http://www.albany.edu/teachingandlearning/directors_welcome.shtml).
The University also offers several grant programs to provide faculty with professional development opportunities. An additional recognition for faculty is the Collins Fellow designation, a faculty service award commemorating Evan R. Collins, president during the years in which the campus became a university center. Table 8.16 shows faculty awards given from 2004-2008. The University also recognizes national, external awards, including Guggenheim Fellowships, MacArthur Awards, Fulbright grants, National Academy memberships, and career awards from NSF and NIH, to name a few.

The University recognizes exceptional teaching and research by faculty members in a number of additional ways. For example, teaching and research are considered, among other criteria, in reviews for discretionary salary increases and for promotion and tenure.

**Protection Against Classroom Violence**

All student conduct at UAlbany is governed by the policies of the Community Rights and Responsibilities handbook, provided during a mandatory freshman orientation. The document broadly defines classroom disruption, ranging from distracting and uncooperative behavior to physical/verbal threats. The Office for Undergraduate Education and the Division of Student Success issued an Advisory on Classroom Disruption and Threatening Behavior by Students in which the defining characteristics of what is considered classroom disruption are provided and where guidance is offered to faculty and staff including eight steps to prevent and respond to disruptive behavior and four strategies for reporting threatening and abusive behavior. Both sets of suggestions proceed sequentially through scenarios, responses, and mechanisms available; these range from clarifying standards of conduct to calling upon University police. Additionally, as the primary campus resource for instructional, curriculum and faculty development, the Institute for Teaching Learning and Academic Leadership provides resources, consultation, and periodic training to faculty and teaching assistants in the area of classroom management.

In any potentially threatening or disruptive set of experiences instructors may seek assistance from the Office of Conflict Resolution & Civic Responsibility. This office assists in reviewing University disciplinary regulations with both parties; it meets with accused students formally, or informally, and/or develops behavioral contracts with them. At any appropriate point, assistance may be provided by the University Counseling Center or the University Police Department, who, along with the Office of Conflict Resolution & Civic Responsibility, vice provost for Undergraduate Education, and 5-Quad Volunteer Ambulance, are coordinated under the direction of the vice president for Student Success. Issues under their purview include: students at risk, classroom safety, sexual assault, and alcohol abuse. In 2008, this coordinated effort included a series of special presentations on disruptive students and scheduled drop-in meetings for faculty.

9 [http://www.albany.edu/academics/collins.fellow.shtml](http://www.albany.edu/academics/collins.fellow.shtml)
10 [http://www.albany.edu/judicial/docs/classroomadvisory.pdf](http://www.albany.edu/judicial/docs/classroomadvisory.pdf)
Additional safety measures include an extensive system of “Blue Light” emergency phones and alarm systems and the SUNY-NY Alert system, an emergency messaging service offered through the State Emergency Management Office\textsuperscript{11} and SUNY.

Productivity Measures

Research and Scholarship

Relevant productivity measures depend on the specific use of data. Productivity is measured on the individual level for the purpose of distributing discretionary salary raises and for tenure and promotion. It is measured at the department or school/college level for the distribution of general resources (e.g. teaching assistantships) and for monitoring general academic health. It is measured at the University-wide level for comparison with other institutions of higher education. What follows is a synopsis of the measures used at each level of scrutiny. Links to additional detailed information and data on each of the measures are provided in Appendix Table 8.18.

Individual productivity is assessed through the faculty activity reports and in the course of consideration for tenure and promotion. The distribution of discretionary pay is based on faculty activity reports (and the report of the department head). Faculty activity reports provide a way of tracking numerous accomplishments of many individuals. Particularly noteworthy accomplishments often find their way to the University Website and also are cited by the provost in her monthly reports to the Faculty Senate. Examples of faculty activity reports may be found in the document repository, where one can get a sense of recent national recognition, such as awards, elections to society offices, significant rankings of the University’s programs or departments in national surveys, and other noteworthy accomplishments. Tenure and promotion procedures are very thorough and rely on significant amounts of information from impartial and confidential parties.

Measures of productivity that pertain to the departmental level include the National Research Council (NRC) survey, Academic Analytics, Faculty Scholarly Productivity (FSP) Index, completion time of PhD degrees, attrition rate of PhD students, and external departmental reviews. The NRC survey provides a comprehensive analysis of PhD programs in many disciplines; it occurs very infrequently. The FSP index is produced annually; no formal assessment of its validity has been conducted. The use of PhD student completion times and attrition rates to apportion resources can encourage a lowering of academic standards. While such measures represent useful flags regarding departmental effectiveness, they are of dubious value as direct measures of program quality. External departmental reviews paint a more comprehensive picture of performance. They involve a considerable amount of work both by the department and external reviewers. External reviewers are typically eminent members of their discipline and effectively volunteer their time. Their lack of standardization limits their usefulness for comparison across departments.

In the past year, a University-wide Graduate Student Support (GSS) review of PhD programs was carried out. Although the statistics discussed above formed the basis for departmental graduate program quality measurement, departments were permitted to highlight other indicators of their relative disciplinary standings and explain the measured outcomes. Unlike the external

\textsuperscript{11} \url{http://www.semo.state.ny.us/}
departmental reviews, this internal review concentrated on those aspects of productivity relevant for the PhD programs alone. While the GSS review may be valuable, the level of information to be shared publicly is currently being discussed by the UAlbany Senate and UAlbany administration to achieve an optimum balance between confidentiality and realizing the benefits of the information that has been gathered. Although only a select set of senior administrators has been made privy to the results to date, the survey itself, by permitting departmental input at various stages, has overcome many of the concerns voiced in the previous paragraph.

Measures of productivity that pertain to the University as a whole include externally funded research expenditures and faculty qualifications. The importance of research expenditures as a measure of scholarly output depends on the mix of disciplines in the University. Research that relies on extensive laboratory (e.g. biology) or field (e.g. anthropology) work requires grant money to continue. Research expenditures are, in those disciplines, a good measure of output. Where journal editors are the principal arbiters of research quality (e.g. mathematics, economics) research expenditure is not a good quantity or quality measure. Distinguished professorships are a SUNY system-wide mark of academic achievement. As such, they provide a basis for comparison between SUNY campuses, but are less relevant for making more general comparisons of productivity. Given the University’s commitment to excellence, an important challenge for the future is to develop acceptable measures of scholarly productivity at the various levels to allow for systematic comparisons with other institutions, and especially with UAlbany’s aspirational peers.

**Teaching**

Teaching productivity is measured by courses, student FTE and seats filled, by faculty member, department, and school and college. Indirect measures of teaching productivity include student satisfaction scores on the Student Instructional Rating Form (SIRF), which are considered in deliberations for faculty and teaching assistant awards, promotion cases for full-time faculty, and discretionary salary increases. Some departments also use qualitative techniques to evaluate teaching. Learning outcomes are more thoroughly discussed by the committee evaluating General Education at the University.

**Recommendations**

- In general the means by which resources are allocated should be transparent. The fact that summary statistics only represent prima facie evidence of true productivity was recognized in the design of the GSS review. As suggested in the current *Going Forward Plan*, a faculty taskforce could be charged with looking at broader evidence on productivity: high quality, externally sourced information exists in the external reports; recent tenure/promotion case outcomes provide a picture of a department’s general health; national faculty salary surveys provide a measure of “value for money;” direct consultation can shed light on issues flagged in the statistical measures.
Community Engagement by the Faculty

Many of UAlbany’s faculty work to address the needs of communities of diverse type and place, from local to global, through their research, teaching, and service. This has been documented on UAlbany’s community engagement Website, http://www.albany.edu/outreach, and has also been the focus of the Steering Committee on Community Engagement over the past year. The Steering Committee worked to develop a mission and vision statement on community engagement, hosted two community roundtables, reviewed best practices at several public and private research universities, and proposed an Action Plan to Advance Community Engagement at UAlbany. This plan includes strategies to strengthen understanding of the nature of this work and to use it to further enrich students’ educational experience. One of these strategies is the support of faculty interest in community-engaged scholarship, beginning with discussions about the nature of scholarship and how it relates to community engagement. It is anticipated that UAlbany faculty involved in model federally-funded community-action research programs — including the Center for the Elimination of Minority Health Disparities and the Prevention Center at the School of Public Health — will serve as resources in this discussion. Also included is a strategy for increasing faculty awareness of opportunities to enhance classroom experiences through the development of service-learning courses and/or courses involving community-engaged research.
APPENDICES

Appendix 8.1: Summary of Recommendations

Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

- The University should place much greater emphasis on its inherent strengths when recruiting faculty. A “view book” for prospective faculty should be prepared in both print and Web form, presenting institutional and faculty profiles, highlights of key research programs, examples of high national rankings and nationally recognized individuals. Location was cited as both a positive and negative in recent surveys: for the many who find Albany a good location, the view book, along with individual recruitment efforts, should place more emphasis on the benefits of being in the state capital, the relatively low cost of living, good educational and housing options, and so on. A supportive environment for women and minorities comes through in the various surveys and this should be highlighted when recruiting new faculty. The Honors College and Presidential Scholars should be promoted as evidence of topnotch UAlbany students. This University-wide material could then be complemented and supplemented by schools and departments. At the school and department level, recruits and current faculty all value the quality and collegiality of departments and research groups. Accordingly, nationally ranked programs should be detailed and highlighted in recruiting material, for both faculty and graduate students.

- Greater investment in personal mentoring and development of all junior faculty, but especially those in highly competitive fields, should be made a priority. This should become a conscious effort led by deans and department chairs, and emphasized during recruitment as one way in which new faculty are supported through their early careers and tenure decisions. At the institutional level, considerations should be given to faculty-oriented services and activities, such as symposia, faculty orientation sessions, and social or cultural events.

- Investment is needed in support of faculty research across more disciplines. Low ratings of infrastructure and support services indicate areas where both targeted and general investments are needed in the number, quality, and availability of support personnel and in supportive technical, laboratory and other research infrastructure. The research support structures further described in the University Support for Faculty section do not reach everyone.

Full-time Faculty

- While increasing full-time faculty numbers may not be immediately possible, broad-based input should be used to align new faculty appointments in order to support core missions and determine an optimum full-time/part-time faculty mix.

- Better institutional data systems should be developed, with linkages between instructor employment status, student outcomes, and assessment data.
Contingent Faculty and Graduate Student Teaching

- Better institutional data systems should be developed, with linkages between instructor employment status and student outcome and assessment data.

- The University should continue to encourage full-year appointments of contingent faculty whenever possible, although realizing budgetary constraints may impact a department’s ability to do so.

- In conjunction with the recommendation in the Going Forward Plan, Section B.1, to support faculty and staff, establish a faculty taskforce, and assign it additional charges:
  
  1. Develop policies and procedures clearly linking the number of contingent faculty with the number of contingent faculty receiving merit salary increases to show consistent rewarding of meritorious service for UAlbany contingent faculty.

  2. Establish an annual orientation specifically for contingent faculty, both new and returning; it would include in-depth communication with respect to policies and procedures, and include such topics as performance expectations, evaluations, appointment/reappointment procedures, opportunities to develop new courses, suggestions for curriculum improvements, information on university governance, encouragement of community, and available support services, such as ITLAL.

- Implement the recommendations in the Going Forward Plan, Section B.2 to provide a University-wide directive stipulating that service counts toward tenure and promotion, and clarifying service expectations both for junior and tenured faculty tenure.

Diversity

- Continue to build upon the efforts of the Office of Diversity and Affirmative Action and those of academic units to realize the University’s goals pertaining to diversity, and specifically:

  1. Hold anti-racism seminars across campus
  2. Establish inter-group dialogues and guest speaker series
  3. Deliberately address the more difficult issues of race
  4. Most importantly, maintain a sustained dialogue on the issue of diversity on campus
Academic Freedom and Integrity

- The policies that state the process as a responsibility of CAFÉ should be updated to reflect the current responsible council.

University Support of Faculty

- Create a center for research.
- Provide an incentive plan or structure for increasing quality research, additional funding, and opportunities for collaboration and training.
- Make improvements/investments in IT.
- As previously stated in the Recruitment Section, improve the showcasing of faculty research.

Productivity Measures

- In general, the means by which resources are allocated should be transparent; summary statistics only represent prima facie evidence of true productivity.
- As suggested in the current *Going Forward Plan* a faculty taskforce could be charged with looking at broader evidence of productivity: high quality externally sourced information exists in the external reports; recent tenure/promotion case outcomes provide a picture of a department’s general health; national faculty salary surveys provide a measure of “value for money;” and direct consultation can shed light on issues flagged in the statistical measures.
Appendix 8.2

Excerpt: University at Albany Mission Statement 1992

Members of the faculty and staff join with their students, undergraduate and graduate, in defining the University as characterized by these discrete, yet interdependent, qualities:

- 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, through co-curricular experiences, to that reinforcement of character 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; and
- Fifth, a commitment to profit intellectually and imaginatively from differences of opinion and of culture.
## Appendix 8.3: Full-time Faculty by Rank and Percent Change from Base Year 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Ranks</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Change from Base Year 1990 -18% -3% -21 -39 -8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Ranks</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Change from Base Year 1990 -1% -13% -9% 25% 24%


Source: 1990-1999 SUNY System Administration, Office of Institutional Research
## Appendix 8.4 Counts of Full-time/Part-time Faculty by School, College, or Other Units 2000-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/College</th>
<th>FTPT</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Full Time</th>
<th>N Change 2000-'08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Rockefeller Schi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Aff. &amp; Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 School of Criminal Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 School of Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 School of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 School of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 College of Information and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 School of Social Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 College of Nanoscale Science and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Other Non-Departmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Schools/Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Part-time faculty exclude DOH faculty affiliated with the School of Public Health
Note: Other non-departmental units: Athletics, Atmospheric Science Research Center, NE Regional Forensics Institute
Note: FT Faculty counts in this table will not match the counts in Table 8.3, as that table is based on data definitions used by the National Center of Education Statistics (NCES) which exclude Librarians.
### Appendix 8.5: Total External Awards Received by University at Albany Faculty and Staff: Data Source Office of the Vice President for Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Administered through Research Foundation</th>
<th>Administered through Health Research Inc.</th>
<th>Administered through Rockefeller Institute</th>
<th>Total Awards Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991-1992</td>
<td>$39,200,000</td>
<td>$20,800,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$60,025,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-1993</td>
<td>$39,200,000</td>
<td>$19,500,000</td>
<td>$192,990</td>
<td>$58,892,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-1994</td>
<td>$46,100,000</td>
<td>$14,800,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$61,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>$43,900,000</td>
<td>$24,000,000</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$69,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-1996</td>
<td>$44,600,000</td>
<td>$38,700,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$85,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>$45,500,000</td>
<td>$44,700,000</td>
<td>$833,983</td>
<td>$91,033,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>$49,500,000</td>
<td>$63,000,000</td>
<td>$821,873</td>
<td>$113,321,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>$53,700,000</td>
<td>$64,400,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$118,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>$53,194,676</td>
<td>$60,429,772</td>
<td>$1,045,644</td>
<td>$114,670,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>$64,064,895</td>
<td>$61,331,480</td>
<td>$1,159,360</td>
<td>$126,555,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>$70,379,639</td>
<td>$50,754,593</td>
<td>$1,272,341</td>
<td>$122,406,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>$128,574,737</td>
<td>$63,254,083</td>
<td>$1,426,108</td>
<td>$193,254,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>$141,782,737</td>
<td>$90,914,607</td>
<td>$1,536,565</td>
<td>$234,233,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$196,763,635</td>
<td>$97,542,777</td>
<td>$2,341,912</td>
<td>$296,648,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>$138,784,741</td>
<td>$97,678,813</td>
<td>$3,932,713</td>
<td>$240,396,267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 8.6 Student FTE by Faculty Type Campus Summary. Extracted from the University at Albany Departmental Profiles as of 3/19/2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Category</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Student FTE taught by Tenure-Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Student FTE taught by Non-Tenure Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Student FTE taught by Graduate Students</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Student FTE taught by Other Instructors</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 8.7: Average Salary (in thousands of $s) for Faculty on 9/10 Contracts Only: U.S. Dept. of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System Preliminary Salary Data for 2007-08 as quoted in *National Education Association Higher Education* (2009) Vol. 25 No. 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Lecturer (No Faculty Rank)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Albany</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Binghamton</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Buffalo</td>
<td>118.9</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Brook University</td>
<td>115.6</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 8.8a – University at Albany Peer Analysis – Current Peers

Data Source: Memorandum of Understanding II, University at Albany – State University of New York

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University at Albany</th>
<th>Georgia Institute of Technology</th>
<th>University at Maryland (College Park)</th>
<th>University of Michigan (Ann Arbor)</th>
<th>University of Minnesota (Twin Cities)</th>
<th>University of Wisconsin-Madison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>16,998</td>
<td>16,643</td>
<td>25,260</td>
<td>38,432</td>
<td>22,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Headcount</td>
<td>13,066</td>
<td>14,958</td>
<td>18,751</td>
<td>11,377</td>
<td>18,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Enroll</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees and Certificates Awarded (IPEDS)</td>
<td>4,296</td>
<td>4,008</td>
<td>5,348</td>
<td>3,735</td>
<td>5,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty Headcount (IPEDS)</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Full-Time Faculty (IPEDS)</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% FT Faculty with Tenure (IPEDS)</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Rank Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Full Professor</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Associate Professor</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Assistant Professor</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Instructor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Lecturer/Others</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% No Rank (IPEDS)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student/Faculty Ratios and % Adjunct (IPEDS-EAP 2003)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE/Full-Time FTE</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE/FT Faculty Headcount</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE/FT Faculty Headcount</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE/Tenure Track Faculty</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE/GA &amp; TA</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Course Sections with &lt; 20 students (College Board)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Student FTE</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Year Retention (2003 Cohort, IPEDS)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% First-Time, Full-Time Students Graduating within Six Years (IPEDS)</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Scores 25th and 75th Percentiles (IPEDS EAP 2003)</td>
<td>1030/1230</td>
<td>1230/1420</td>
<td>910/1110</td>
<td>960/1140</td>
<td>1170/1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Freshman with a High School GPA 3.0-3.8 (College Board)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Course Sections with &gt; 50 students (College Board)</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Acceptance Rate (IPEDS EAP 2003)</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures (IPEDS, FY2003-04)$^1$</td>
<td>$23,333</td>
<td>$46,743</td>
<td>$17,650</td>
<td>$10,871</td>
<td>$20,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total E &amp; G/Student FTE</td>
<td>$7,614</td>
<td>$11,074</td>
<td>$4,896</td>
<td>$5,512</td>
<td>$5,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction (incl. support/Student FTE)</td>
<td>$13,908</td>
<td>$13,645</td>
<td>$13,178</td>
<td>$10,117</td>
<td>$18,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Instruction(Grad Student FTE)</td>
<td>$9,624</td>
<td>$10,386</td>
<td>$11,217</td>
<td>$10,133</td>
<td>$9,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Instruction(UG Student FTE)</td>
<td>$18,124</td>
<td>$25,876</td>
<td>$20,541</td>
<td>$14,649</td>
<td>$21,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student FTE</td>
<td>$37,928</td>
<td>$54,478</td>
<td>$57,960</td>
<td>$49,072</td>
<td>$56,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Faculty FTE</td>
<td>$86,227</td>
<td>$129,443</td>
<td>$123,438</td>
<td>$103,037</td>
<td>$110,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Support/Faculty</td>
<td>$278,941</td>
<td>$563,921</td>
<td>$460,207</td>
<td>$370,076</td>
<td>$473,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Expenditures (NSF, 2003-04)$^2$</td>
<td>$120,655</td>
<td>$174,190</td>
<td>$12,388</td>
<td>$30,324</td>
<td>$23,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R &amp; D (in $000's)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(98)</td>
<td>(265)</td>
<td>(187)</td>
<td>(210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate R &amp; D (in $000's)</td>
<td>(76)</td>
<td>(203)</td>
<td>$6,092</td>
<td>$18,882</td>
<td>$8,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal R &amp; D (in $000's)</td>
<td>(102)</td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(250)</td>
<td>(179)</td>
<td>(233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Scholarship (IPEDS, FY2003-04)$^3$</td>
<td>$21,256</td>
<td>$209.4</td>
<td>$7.7</td>
<td>$20.7</td>
<td>$18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications/FT Faculty FTE 98-99</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications/FT Tenure Fac 98-99</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations/FT Faculty 98-01</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations/FT Faculty 98-99</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Middle States Self-Study – Chapter 8: Faculty

Note: This table reflects the most recent data available from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS 2003-04), the College Board Annual Survey of Colleges (2004-05), Institute for Scientific Information (ISI), National Science Foundation (NSF), Carnegie Foundation (2003), and data files maintained by the State University of New York Office of Institutional Research and Analysis.


2. IPEDS Financial Statistics 2003-04 with additional analysis by SUNY Office of Institutional Research and Analysis. Note Graduate Instruction expenditure data does not include first-professional.

3. Institute for Scientific Information (ISI), summarized by SUNY Office of Institutional Research and Analysis; publications converted to full article equivalents; note full-time faculty are instructional/research faculty regardless of tenure status.
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### Appendix 8.8B: University at Albany Peer Analysis – Aspirational Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University at Albany</th>
<th>Aspirational Peer Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Headcount Enrollment (IPEDS)</strong> 16,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Full-Time Headcount Enrollment (IPEDS)</strong> 13,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Percent of Enrollment which is Full-Time (IPEDS)</strong> 76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Degrees and Certificates Awarded (IPEDS)</strong> 4,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Faculty Headcount (IPEDS)</strong> 943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>% Full-Time Faculty (IPEDS)</strong> 63.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>% FT Faculty with Tenure (IPEDS)</strong> 65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Faculty Rank Distribution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Full Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Lecturer/Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% No Rank (IPEDS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Student/Faculty Ratios and % Adjunct (IPEDS-EAP 2003)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student FTE/Total Faculty FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student FTE/Tenure Faculty Headcount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student FTE/Tenure Faculty Headcount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student FTE/Tenure Track Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student FTE/TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Adjunct Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>% Course Sections with &lt; 20 students (College Board)</strong> 25.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>% Course Sections with &gt; 50 students (College Board)</strong> 22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>First-Year Retention (2003 Cohort, IPEDS)</strong> 84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>% First-Time, Full-Time Students Graduating within Six Years (IPEDS)</strong> 65.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SAT Scores 25th and 75th Percentiles (IPEDS IC04)</strong> 1030/1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>% Freshmen with a High School GPA &gt; 3.0 (College Board)</strong> 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Freshman Acceptance Rate (IPEDS IC04)</strong> 55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Expenditures (IPEDS, FY 2003-04)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total R &amp; D (in 1000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction/Student FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction (incl. support)/Student FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Total E &amp; G spent on Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate Instruction/Student FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate as % Total Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grad Instruction/Grad Student FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate as % Total Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research/FT Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research support/FT Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Research incl/support/FT Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Total R &amp; E spent on Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Research Expenditures (NSF, 2003)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total R &amp; D (in 1000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal R &amp; D (in 1000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total R &amp; D per FT Faculty (in 1000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Faculty Scholarship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publications/FT Faculty 98-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publications/FT Faculty 99-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publications/FT Faculty 00-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citations/FT Faculty 99-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citations/FT Faculty 98-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Basic Carnegie Classification (Carnegie Foundation, 2005)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table reflects the most recent data available from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS-2003-04), the College Board Annual Survey of Colleges (2004-05), Institute for Scientific Information (ISI, National Science Foundation (NSF), Carnegie Foundation (2005), and data files maintained by the State University of New York Office of Institutional Research and Analysis.

1 Course Section Size Data for Stony Brook University taken from the 2003-04 College Board Annual Survey of Colleges.
2 IPEDS Financial Statistics 2003-04 with additional analysis by SUNY Office of Institutional Research and Analysis; note Graduate Instruction expenditure data does not include first-professional.
3 Institute for Scientific Information (ISI), summarized by SUNY Office of Institutional Research and Analysis; publications converted to full article equivalents; note full-time faculty are instructional/research faculty regardless of tenure status.
Appendix 8.9: Campus Comparison of Fall Only Part-time Faculty Appointments to Academic Year Part-time Faculty Appointments

Note: these data in the chart below are as of 9/1 each year; they do not reflect additional staff for the spring semesters, thus the difference in numbers from Table 8.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Appts</th>
<th>Fall 2006 Only</th>
<th>AY 06-07</th>
<th>Total Appts 9/1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>263</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Appts</th>
<th>Fall 2007 Only</th>
<th>AY 07-08</th>
<th>Total Appts 9/1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Change from 06-07: 19% -14% 12%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Appts</th>
<th>Fall 2008 Only</th>
<th>AY 08-09</th>
<th>Total Appts 9/1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>412</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Change from 07-08: 32% 0% 27%

From OHRM

Table 8.10 University at Albany Merit Awards by FT/PT Faculty Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part-time faculty merit Awards:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>21 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>10 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>all staff receive 1% merit increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>14 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>26 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>20 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>23 staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time contingent faculty merit awards:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>9 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>10 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>all staff received 1% merit increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>13 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>16 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>14 staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>18 staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From OHRM
## Appendix 8.11 Doctorate Degrees Awarded and Time to Degree: Degree Award Years 2003-04 to 2007-08

As of 1/7/2009 Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program or Department</th>
<th>Number of Degrees</th>
<th>Mean Time to Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth &amp; Atmospheric Sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biopsychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive/Devl Psych</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/Org Psych</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Personality Psy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Studies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Science</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Criminal Justice</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration &amp; Policy Studies</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Psychology</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nanoscale Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Science</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health &amp; Toxicology</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology &amp; Biostatistics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration &amp; Policy</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Social Welfare</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Departments</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>6.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 8.12 UAlbany - Trends in Gender Distribution of FT Faculty by Rank

**UAlbany - Trends in Gender Distribution of FT Faculty by Rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Female Count</th>
<th>Male Count</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>% within year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 Professor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50 Research Professor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 Assoc Professor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>127.0%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>200.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 Asst Professor</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>113.6%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>200.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 Librarian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
<td>130.6%</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>200.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 Assoc Librarian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>146.8%</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>200.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00 Asst Librarian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>150.2%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>200.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00 Lecturer</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>110.8%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>200.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Trends in Diversity of UAlbany Faculty by Gender

Table Showing Part-Time Female Faculty as Percent of Total Within Each Year, by Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Prof</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prof-R</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof-R</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Prof-R</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Lib</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Lib</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FT Faculty Race/Ethnicity Trends by Rank, University-wide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>ethnic# Recoded ethnic status from HR record</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 Professor</td>
<td>1.00 White</td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td></td>
<td>89.60%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>89.40%</td>
<td>89.10%</td>
<td>87.60%</td>
<td>86.20%</td>
<td>87.90%</td>
<td>85.50%</td>
<td>83.60%</td>
<td>87.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 Associate Professor</td>
<td>2.00 Black/African American</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 Assistant Professor</td>
<td>3.00 Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 Assistant Professor</td>
<td>4.00 Asian American/Pacific Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>7.80%</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>8.40%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00 NRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00 Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50 Research Professor</td>
<td>1.50 White</td>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.90%</td>
<td>83.40%</td>
<td>83.10%</td>
<td>83.50%</td>
<td>86.00%</td>
<td>81.90%</td>
<td>80.90%</td>
<td>75.60%</td>
<td>73.60%</td>
<td>81.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 Professor</td>
<td>2.00 Black/African American</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>5.30%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 Assistant Professor</td>
<td>3.00 Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
<td>5.40%</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 Associate Professor</td>
<td>4.00 Asian American/Pacific Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>8.10%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00 NRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00 Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 8.14 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>ethnic# Recoded ethnic status from HR record</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.50 Research Assoc Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>83.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 Black/Afric American</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00 NRA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 Asst Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>74.50%</td>
<td>72.90%</td>
<td>69.40%</td>
<td>70.90%</td>
<td>71.30%</td>
<td>60.80%</td>
<td>49.20%</td>
<td>38.30%</td>
<td>37.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 Black/Afric American</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 Asian Amer/Pacif Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>11.90%</td>
<td>13.50%</td>
<td>13.30%</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 Amer Ind/Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00 NRA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>12.20%</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00 Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>10.80%</td>
<td>22.10%</td>
<td>34.00%</td>
<td>34.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50 Research Asst Prof</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 Librarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 8.14 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>ethnic# Recoded ethnic status from HR record</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.00 Assoc Librarian</td>
<td>1.00 White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>93.80%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>99.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00 Asst Librarian</td>
<td>1.00 White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>78.90%</td>
<td>84.20%</td>
<td>83.30%</td>
<td>88.20%</td>
<td>85.70%</td>
<td>81.30%</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>69.20%</td>
<td>78.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>11.80%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00 Lecturer</td>
<td>1.00 White</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>73.10%</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
<td>84.70%</td>
<td>82.90%</td>
<td>80.60%</td>
<td>81.10%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>71.10%</td>
<td>69.60%</td>
<td>77.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>4.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PT Faculty Race/Ethnicity Trends by Rank, University-wide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>ethnic# Recoded ethnic status from HR record</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 Professor</td>
<td>1.00 White</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>84.60%</td>
<td>90.90%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>83.30%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>93.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00 Asian/Pacific Island</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>15.40%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.00 NRA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50 Research Professor</td>
<td>1.00 White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 Assoc Professor</td>
<td>1.00 White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>9.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 Research Assoc Prof</td>
<td>1.00 White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>30.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 Assnt Professor</td>
<td>1.00 White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>69.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00 Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.00 NRA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>18.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.00 Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 Assnt Professor</td>
<td>1.00 White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>66.70%</td>
<td>83.30%</td>
<td>63.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00 Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>16.70%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.00 NRA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>18.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.00 Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>9.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within year</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 8.15 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>ethnic# Recoded ethnic status from HR record</th>
<th>6.00 NRA</th>
<th>4.00 Librarian</th>
<th>5.00 Assoc Librarian</th>
<th>6.00 Asst Librarian</th>
<th>7.00 Lecturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50 Research Asst Prof</td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>% within year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 Librarian</td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>% within year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 Assoc Librarian</td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>% within year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00 Asst Librarian</td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>% within year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00 Lecturer</td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>% within year</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>% within year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- The table displays the count and percentage of faculty within each rank and ethnic category from 2000 to 2008.
- The percentages indicate the proportion of faculty within each year.
- The total counts and percentages are shown at the bottom of the table for each category.
### Appendix 8.16

**Fall 2005 Student and Faculty/Staff Diversity Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UnitID</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Pct FT Faculty Diverse</th>
<th>Pct FT Faculty Black</th>
<th>Pct Executive Admin Diverse</th>
<th>Pct Executive Admin Black</th>
<th>Pct Professionals Diverse</th>
<th>Pct Professionals Black</th>
<th>Pct Clerical Diverse</th>
<th>Pct Clerical Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129020</td>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196079</td>
<td>SUNY at Binghamton</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141574</td>
<td>U. of Hawaii at Manoa</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225511</td>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126614</td>
<td>U. of Colorado at Boulder</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147703</td>
<td>Northern Illinois University</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240453</td>
<td>U. of Wisconsin-Milwaukee</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139755</td>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology-Main Campus</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232982</td>
<td>Old Dominion University</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196060</td>
<td>Average (current peers)</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234076</td>
<td>U. of Virginia-Main Campus</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110653</td>
<td>University of California-Irvine</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110680</td>
<td>U. of California-San Diego</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110705</td>
<td>U. of California-Santa</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110714</td>
<td>U of California-Santa Cruz</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209551</td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196088</td>
<td>SUNY at Buffalo</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196091</td>
<td>SUNY at Stony Brook</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 8.17: Internally-Funded Research Support: University at Albany Drescher Award 10-Year Summary

#### 1999-2003 Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leave Commencing in Academic Year</th>
<th>Number of Leaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999 – 2000</td>
<td>No awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 – 2001</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 – 2002</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 - 2003</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2003 – 2007 Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leave Commencing in Academic Year</th>
<th>Number of Leaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003 – 2004</td>
<td>No awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>No awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2007 – 2011 Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leave Commencing in Academic Year</th>
<th>Number of Leaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>No awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>14 under consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **Drescher Awards** are a union-negotiated benefit funded by the institution. The Dr. Nuala McGann Drescher Affirmative Action/Diversity Leave Program enhances employment opportunities with preference given to minorities, women, employees with disabilities and Vietnam-era veterans who are preparing for permanent or continuing appointments. The Affirmative Action/Diversity Committee seeks to promote a broad diversity of award recipients. The types of support available include:

- Payment of employee's regular salary by the campus
- Salary for a replacement
- Tuition and fees for course work
- Registration fees for conferences and workshops
- Course-related and research-related supplies
- Travel and related expenses for research or study
Appendix 8.18: Location of Data and Summary Statistics on Measures of Scholarly Output

1. Faculty Activity Reports: The form is at http://www.albany.edu/academic_affairs/faculty_activity_report/

2. Tenure and Promotion procedures: every member of faculty who comes up for tenure or promotion has to undergo scrutiny of their scholarship as specified in the guidelines at:
   http://www.albany.edu/cas/_private/chair_manual_and_forms/AdministrativeProceduresforthePreparationo
   fRecommendations.doc

3. Externally funded research expenditure summary data:
   http://www.albany.edu/research/VPRDocs/ResearchPerformanceDashboard.pdf  Detailed data are at
   http://www.albany.edu/research/Publications&Reports.htm

   Data indicate that external support for research has been holding steady over recent years. The largest spender of
   external funding has been the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering (CNSE).

4. Faculty qualifications: There are 14 distinguished professors currently on faculty.

5. National Research Council (NRC) survey; it surveys PhD programs about every 12 years (a new one is currently
   due out); the source for last report and status of next one at:
   http://sites.nationalacademies.org/pga/Resdoc/index.htm

6. National Faculty Salary Surveys: Produced each year by College and University Professional Association for
   Human Resources (CUPA-HR): http://www.cupahr.org/surveys/salarysurvey2008-09.asp;
   Also produced by the American Association of University Professors; data made available through the Chronicle of
   Higher Education: http://chronicle.com/stats/aaup/

7. Faculty Scholarly Productivity (FSP) Index, a report purchased annually by the University from Academic
   Analytics: http://www.academicanalytics.com/About/AboutUs.aspx,
   Generally faculty have not been made privy to the latest results. Parts of previous editions were distributed.

Appendix 8.19: Faculty Awards 2004-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collins Fellows</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Service Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Teaching Professor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Research Awards</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Teaching Awards</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Academic Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Librarianship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Teaching Part-time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 9: Educational Offerings and General Education

Overview

As articulated in earlier mission statements and emphasized in the recent Going Forward Plan, the University strives to provide a high quality education that will allow students to become productive and creative employees, leaders, and global citizens. UAlbany also works to provide high-quality graduate training. This chapter begins with an assessment of how well the University is meeting its vitally important goal of providing undergraduate and graduate students with the discipline-based knowledge and more general skills and experiences, including research skills and experiences, appropriate for a research University. The second section analyzes how UAlbany provides students with an appreciation of diversity in its many facets and the capacity to be engaged global citizens. The third section examines the General Education program, which was developed in response to a mandate from the SUNY Board of Trustees designed to create greater uniformity, and thus enhance transferability of courses, across the SUNY system. The fourth section examines how well the University supports educational offerings with learning resources such as library collections and information technology. The final section looks at how well the curriculum, as well as the faculty and learning resources that support its delivery, respond to changes both within and outside the academy. Throughout, consideration will be given to how well the University has responded to curriculum challenges and whether the University is prepared to ensure a coherent and relevant set of educational offerings in the future. Specific recommendations for improvement are included.

Quality of Educational Offerings in the Major

The first priority of both the graduate and undergraduate programs at UAlbany is to provide a rigorous and well-rounded educational experience. At the graduate level, excellence is more discipline-based, while, at the undergraduate level, the University strives for discipline-based excellence joined with core skills such as analysis and reasoning, oral and written communication, and information literacy.

The current array of doctoral offerings addresses the mission and goals of the University at Albany as a research University. Programs, particularly in the sciences, tend to be generalist programs (e.g., there are doctoral programs in Biological Sciences and Biomedical Sciences, but not separate doctoral programs in, for example, Botany, Cell Biology, Ecology, Entomology, Molecular Pharmacology, and Pharmacology). Undergraduates, too, are invited into the research enterprise at the heart of the University’s mission. There is an annual University-wide research conference, departmental research conferences, a University program that helps match Honors students with research mentors, undergraduate participation in faculty research projects, participation in national conferences, and co-authorship. In addition, the University's mission encompasses the needs of the public sector, and the institution does very well in training students in professional doctoral programs; most programs enjoying strong national reputations are professional programs.
Content, Rigor, and Depth

To examine with rigor, depth and breadth both graduate and undergraduate programs for evidence of coherent learning experiences, the University weighed department self-studies prepared for program reviews (see Chapter 5. Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment of Student Learning), the assessment of outside evaluators, and student opinion surveys. A sample of self-studies conducted within the last seven years to assess quality of instruction throughout the University was closely examined. A review of the materials provided by departments and the evaluations by outside experts confirm that current degree programs contain sufficient content, rigor, and depth, and that there is a clear distinction between graduate and undergraduate programs. While the purpose of regular review and assessment is to identify areas of strength and weakness, the external reviews have been predominantly positive and speak to the quality of instruction throughout the University. Without exception, external reviews in the sample noted that graduate and undergraduate programs are sound. For example, in assessing the merits of one department, external reviewers noted that undergraduate and graduate students were “overwhelmingly positive” about the program, and that it is a “rigorous program with nice balance between research and teaching.” Similar praise was offered of another undergraduate program: “a stable and healthy program that attempts to be responsive and responsible to emerging concepts in [the field’s] pedagogy and practices.” Several academic units could rest on their laurels, but continue to seek improvement. For example, external reviewers commended the faculty in the School of Criminal Justice for their drive to continually improve despite their strong national ranking, which has placed the School “ahead of the curve” and which they felt will serve the School especially well during these difficult times.

At the graduate level, academic units strive to advance their national and international distinction through faculty and student recruitment and the maintaining of quality programs. The University has several distinguished graduate programs, as ranked by the U.S. News & World Report, which is regarded as a standard measure of reputation. These programs include: Biology; Education; English; Fine Arts; Library and Information Studies; Mathematics; Clinical Psychology; Public Affairs; Criminal Justice (which has consistently ranked second in the nation); Social Welfare; and Sociology. In addition, Black Issues in Higher Education (July 2009), which ranks programs by number of degrees awarded, identified UAlbany’s Africana Studies master’s degree program as first in the country. Though there is no category yet for ranking programs offered by the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering, the annual college ranking by Small Times magazine named it first among colleges for nanotechnology and microtechnology in May 2007.

A ranking of most of UAlbany’s doctoral programs by the National Research Council (NRC) is expected in spring 2010 and will be made public when available. In addition, the University has subscribed to Academic Analytics (AA), a company that assesses and provides comparative data on “faculty scholarly productivity” for doctoral programs nationwide. By agreement with the vendor, these data are not made public. Using the AA data allows the University to assess internal program strength, which NRC has determined is directly correlated with faculty scholarly productivity. For example, the Office of Graduate Studies will be able to see how a particular program ranks in each area against its peers—in terms of book and/or journal publications, both as a group and per capita, and in terms of citations, federal research funding, and professional honors/awards. Although there are unavoidable gaps in data for both NRC and
AA (industry grants and local/state government grants are not readily accessible via Web-crawling software, and the two companies that supply journal and citation information are rivals, which occasions some gaps in the humanities data at the moment), each type of program will be evaluated along the same dimensions (and limitations of data, if any exist) as every other similar program in the country.

In developing the self-study report, difficulties associated with evaluating department and faculty quality were consistently raised. In particular, NRC and Academic Analytics attempt to quantify snapshots of faculty productivity in terms of activity, but these measures do not necessarily reflect quality. Both represent a trend away from the use of “reputational” measures in evaluating graduate programs. Concern was raised that the Academic Analytics data are flawed, and faculty who met with AA representatives took issue with their methods and the fact that the data are not made publicly available. Academic Analytics has been given stringent scrutiny by UAlbany faculty, who have made useful suggestions for improving the scope of the product and clarifying its use of statistics (e.g. z-scores). One additional problem that may arise when the NRC study is finally published is that it will be based on faculty who were at the University in 2006. Thus the study may already be dated, though it is likely that the NRC will be considered the most reliable program ranking within the disciplines.

It is extremely important to continue campus-wide discussion on key topics: what measures are being used and why; what those measures do and do not show about departments and faculty; and what other kinds of data may be needed to supplement these outside evaluations. For example, other possible indicators of graduate program quality include, but are not limited to: publishing with graduate students, effective graduate teaching and mentoring, professionalization, preparing graduate students to teach, and graduate student placement upon degree completion.

Currently, doctoral programs are being reviewed by a Graduate Student Support (GSS) Doctoral Review Panel. Prior to that, a review of these programs had not been conducted since 1997. The GSS Doctoral Review Panel is analyzing data supplied by Institutional Research, evaluating program quality in terms of national ranking information (AA and NRC), looking closely at additional data and contextual discussions supplied by individual departments, and assigning each program a numerical value. Data gathering took place during summer 2009, analysis occurred during the fall 2009 semester, and a report was provided to the provost in December. An important goal of the GSS Doctoral Program Review is to identify those programs which can clearly be designated as ones of quality. It is likely the Review will demonstrate a fairly broad array of high-quality programs or programs with potential to become of high quality (as did the 1997 study). The study will also likely point to quality heretofore not recognized, as well as point out weaknesses in programs that may need a fair amount of resources to remedy.

**Recommendation:**

- Faculty should be encouraged to discuss how graduate quality is being assessed; the correlation between productivity and quality should be examined, and the possibility of collecting internal data that assess other possible dimensions of quality evaluated.
Critical Thinking and Active Learning for a Coherent Educational Experience

As noted above, a key goal at UAlbany is to provide students with the critical thinking and analytic skills that will allow them to apply and create knowledge, rather than simply absorb it. At the undergraduate level, in addition to critical thinking skills that are taught within each major, several General Education requirements, discussed later in this chapter, focus directly on the development of these skills.

The University also provides numerous and growing opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students to participate in their own learning. Classroom activities and assignments, service learning opportunities, University-wide and departmental internships, and research experiences are among the major ways that students increase and apply their knowledge. There is course credit for internships involving off-campus participation in the work of an agency, institution, or corporate body beyond the University, with collateral academic study. The 2008 Middle States Survey shows that 47% of undergraduate students feel that sufficient internship opportunities exist at UAlbany. Of those who have pursued internship opportunities, 70% find that high quality placements exist, and 73% find such placements relevant to their programs. Of course, the availability of such opportunities does not indicate how these internships contribute to student learning experiences. While 56% of students who had participated in an internship program answered “somewhat” or “very relevant” when asked how useful their internships had been to their educational program, a University-wide mechanism for assessing such learning experiences would provide more evidence of students’ learning outcomes. The Institute for Teaching, Learning and Academic Leadership (ITLAL) offers all UAlbany faculty and teaching staff workshops and consultations on student-centered learning, team-based approaches, and how to design courses and syllabi to emphasize critical thinking. There are also many publications and resources on the ITLAL Website that instructors can use to re-tool their courses or create new ones to help students think conceptually, actively engage in their own learning, and hone analytic skills.

Recommendation:

- The University should develop a more systematic approach for assessing how internship programs contribute to students’ educational experience.

Learning Objectives

At UAlbany, it is generally recognized that learning is maximized when students know what is expected of them, and the creation of clear learning goals also allows assessment of how well UAlbany courses and programs are contributing to the educational mission of the University. Much of the focus, however, has been at the program, rather than at the course, level and, at present, only courses that fulfill a General Education requirement are mandated to list their learning objectives on the syllabus.
To assess how often and how well learning objectives are articulated across the curriculum, a sample of syllabi was examined and put into one of three categories: 1) course goals and objectives clearly stated 2) mention of course goals or objectives, but not clearly stated 3) no mention of course goals and objectives. Though the raw numbers are small, the patterns are instructive. At the undergraduate level, 41% (11) of the syllabi reviewed stated clear learning objectives. Among the 26% (7) of syllabi that fell into the second category, some provided rich description of course topics and essentially embedded goals within them. Whether students discern those goals would likely vary by experience and motivation. Others state general goals, such as expertise in the course content. In the third category are syllabi (9) that do not specify any learning objectives, and provide little to no descriptive information. The majority (66%) of the graduate syllabi reviewed articulate learning objectives clearly.

In 2008-2009 the provost’s office asked for department reviews of learning goals. In addition to results of assessments reported in the self-study, learning objectives are assessed regularly throughout the range of undergraduate and graduate courses taught. Resources and expertise are made available to programs to help them work towards enhancing the validity and reliability of the measures. It should be noted, however, that some faculty have expressed concern about both the time required of faculty to participate in program and General Education assessment and the methods used to assess undergraduate and graduate courses. Systematic data are needed to capture the breadth and range of faculty opinion.

**Recommendations:**

- Because clearly defined goals and linked assessments are important to student learning, it is recommended that the University consider requiring they be included on the syllabus of every course at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

- Systematic data should be collected on faculty perspectives about assessment, including how best to assess learning in faculty’s courses and disciplines.

**Number of Faculty and Quality of Instruction**

The student-to-faculty ratio has been hovering between 20:1 and 19:1 over the past decade, and is currently at 19:1. Peer institutions tend to have lower ratios, with Buffalo at 16:1 and Stony Brook at 18:1. Binghamton, however, is now at 20:1. While the University has increased the number of small courses offered, there are 28 more large lecture courses (100+ seats) than there were 5 years ago; the increase in smaller sections likely corresponds to an increase in discussion sections for large lecture courses.

Reports by external reviewers reveal that, while quality of instruction remains high, faculty in many departments are overtaxed, striving to cover courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels while maintaining research productivity. While many programs were praised for quality of instruction in the external reviews, some weaknesses were identified, almost always due to resource issues. At times reviewers noted places for development and program expansion, but at

---

1 The syllabi sample was identical to the one used by the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee, and is detailed in Table 5.4.
the same time pointed to the problem of resources even for sustaining current programs. This was especially apparent in one department deemed unable to meet programmatic requirements. According to the reviewers, that department had “insufficient faculty” to meet programmatic needs, stemming from difficulty with graduate student recruitment and reduction in faculty lines. Throughout the sample of external evaluations, the reviewers pointed to the critical importance of the ability to hire and retain outstanding faculty in numbers consistent with programmatic needs, to recruit graduate students, and to maintain and update facilities in order to ensure quality educational offerings at all levels.

In some cases, there has been a high level of reliance on part-time labor for instruction. The “Going Forward Plan” recognized this issue, and it is recommended that this discussion continue. Institutional Research chart “Instructional Faculty and Class Size” for fall 2007, for example, reveals that there are 640 part-time instructors to 672 full-time instructors. While degree information is given for full-time faculty, no degree information is offered for part-time instructors, presumably because such information is not collected. While part-time instructors are often outstanding teachers, there is currently no uniform mechanism in place to ensure quality of instruction among part-time instructors. According to the UUP representative for part-time labor, the hiring of adjuncts is not monitored; there is no search procedure, and in many cases there is not even an interview process. In most departments, the adjunct lecturers do not receive support or mentoring. There is also no departmental evaluation procedure for part-time instructors other than student evaluations, which is arguably problematic.

The credentials of full-time faculty necessarily vary across disciplines. In research fields, full-time faculty typically hold the doctoral degree, according to the chart “Instructional Faculty and Class Size.” Though data on the credentials of part-time faculty is not available, anecdotal evidence suggests that many of the part-time faculty also hold the highest degrees in their fields. The professional schools and programs, in particular, routinely draw on experts from the larger community to teach in their respective fields. Because the degree is not the primary criterion for judging merit in the arts, resident writers and artists may not hold an advanced degree, though they are well regarded and well published.

Meeting Changing Needs through Curricular Change

Despite severe budget limitations, the University has responded to external changes in recent years by creating new majors, in such fields as public health, journalism, documentary studies, forensic chemistry, financial market regulation and nanoscale science. There are new minors: organizational studies; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) studies; bioethics; informatics; and neuroscience. The new majors and minors reflect growing opportunities, needs and interest at the state and/or national level in educating undergraduates in these fields. In public health, for example, there is growing national interest in undergraduate education, both to create a better educated citizenry and to help address the critical shortage of well-trained public health professionals prepared to confront issues such as health care reform, disaster preparedness, and emerging or re-emerging infectious disease threats. Until recently, the UAlbany School of Public Health (like most such schools in the U.S.) focused entirely on graduate education. Over the past decade, starting with an introductory course, the school has significantly expanded its undergraduate offerings. It now has both a major and a minor in public
All of these undergraduate programs help to prepare students for careers and/or advanced education in public health, as well as understand the broader public health context should they decide to pursue a career in a related field, such as medicine, nursing, or law. The other new majors are similarly responding to cutting edge opportunities and needs, preparing students for future study, careers, and engaged citizenship.

Many of the external reviews commend the high quality of faculty and instruction, and the University continues to seek ways to improve course delivery to ensure appropriate content, rigor, and depth consistently at all levels. There are mechanisms in place to support instructors, as will be discussed in the next section, and awards at the college, university and chancellor levels to recognize excellence in teaching at all ranks. According to the 2008 Middle States Survey, most teaching faculty, including part-time instructors, are committed to course development, even when their academic units do not provide any form of material support or recognition for such innovations.

Results of the 2008 Middle States Survey, however, indicate some areas of concern regarding support for improvements to educational offerings. While satisfaction with the University’s overall “support for teaching” had a somewhat favorable mean rating of 3.61 (scale of 1 – 5; 1 being “most negative” and 5 being “most positive”), the mean rating from those with experience as faculty at other universities skews toward the negative at 2.75. This suggests that adequate support for teaching may not be at a desired level in comparison to other universities. With regard to encouragement, rewards and resources provided by academic units for new course development, curricular improvement (what is taught), and instructional improvement (how it is taught), findings indicate some potential concerns. Faculty indicate that they are likely to engage in new course development, and perceive this to be encouraged and rewarded by their academic units, with adequate resources provided by their units to fulfill their efforts. However, perceptions regarding curricular and instructional improvements suffer by comparison. While 71% of the faculty indicate that they are likely to engage in both activities to some degree, the percentages of faculty perceiving encouragement, reward, and available resources to support these activities skew negatively, in some cases by large margins. Open-ended responses indicated that leading factors influencing whether or not faculty would develop new courses or make improvements to existing ones included student demand and available time.

Graduate students teach an increasing number of undergraduate courses on campus, which may have implications for the quality of instruction and graduate students’ ability to complete their degrees, though data on this are not available. A central tension exists in using graduate students to cover undergraduate courses and ensuring these students get through their programs in a timely manner. A review of graduate course offerings for 2008 showed that 18 departments offer courses on teaching; 12 of these are in the College of Arts and Sciences, where the bulk of undergraduate teaching occurs. In addition, the Office of Graduate Studies is currently working on an initiative to offer an internal certificate for graduate students from any program interested in developing their teaching profile and competence. This is a collaborative project between the Dean of Graduate Studies and ITLAL, with the cooperation and support of the School of Education. Some difficulties with logistics remain to be worked out so that courses can appear on transcripts as 0 or 1-credit courses. The fact that enrollments have been steady (10-15 in each
course) suggests that there is demand for such courses, even though they are optional and for minimal credit.

Results from the National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE) and answers to the 2008 Middle States Re-Accreditation Survey indicate that students believe the quality of faculty instruction could be improved. Answers to an open-ended question from transfer students about their UAlbany experience suggests that though there are “good and bad teachers” at the University, the large class sizes and faculty approaches to teaching compare negatively to their experiences at other schools. Respondents report that “teachers are hard to get in touch with” and “many teachers do not really care about their students” and that teaching seems “like an imposition” on many faculty. Of course there are many faculty members who are committed and effective teachers, but the student opinion results point to a central tension at a major research university – how can quality instruction be ensured from faculty who prefer or feel pressure to focus primarily on their research? The “Going Forward Plan” suggests that teaching effectiveness is not stressed as highly as it might be and acknowledges a need to clarify the degree to which teaching counts toward tenure and promotion. The plan also recommends increased recognition and support for teaching effectiveness and innovations.

Recommendations:

Regarding large courses, analysis by department of faculty-student ratios and teaching effectiveness should be carried out to ensure that quality of instruction is not compromised and that the faculty-student ratio be maintained, or even decreased, despite increasing enrollments.

- Because undergraduate instruction depends increasingly on adjunct labor, the University should undertake a review assessing: hiring practices; greater support and mentoring; systematic reporting of degree data; and a formal departmental evaluation process. The review could also examine the possibility of creating a category of “tenured instructors,” which exists at other SUNY institutions, as a way to offer stability to those upon whom the University relies so heavily for teaching, while providing these instructors with greater purpose as they serve this institution.

- A committee should be convened to gather systemic data from departments about how well graduate students are being prepared to teach effectively and to balance teaching and their own learning responsibilities. The committee could also identify best practices, such as graduate co-teaching internships, and make suggestions for campus-wide and departmental changes, keeping in mind faculty workload and resource issues.

- The University should examine how encouragement and resource availability for curricular/instructional development could be enhanced. Departments should be enabled to assign resources to develop and implement new courses or innovations to compensate for the time faculty must expend.
Producing Global Citizens

A second major mission of UAlbany is to provide students with an appreciation of diversity and the capacity to be engaged global citizens. The University recently chose as its overarching theme “The World Within Reach,” reflecting the importance it places on preparing students for life and careers in the global community. One way to achieve this is by bringing global and diversity issues and interdisciplinarity to coursework. Another major conduit is study abroad, and a third is access to out-of-classroom experiences that engage students with the diverse wider world.

Bringing Global Awareness and Interdisciplinary Opportunities to the Curriculum

Student responses to the 2008 Middle States survey and data gathered from Websites and key personnel suggest there are quality opportunities for interdisciplinary and global study available at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The Interdisciplinary Studies Committee (ISC) of the Undergraduate Academic Council reviews and coordinates serious independent study, research, and internships not provided through other course offerings, as well as specific courses taught by faculty from more than one school. Though there is a long tradition of cross-listing undergraduate and graduate courses between departments, in 2003 the College of Arts and Sciences strategic plan called for enhancing the coherence of curricula within and across departments by increasing the number of cross-listed courses. There is also a generous cross-registration policy if UAlbany does not offer what a student needs: students may register for courses off campus and have them covered by tuition. In addition, students can initiate their own interdisciplinary major or minor, subject to the approval of the aforementioned committee.

Analysis of course offerings indicated that global issues are integrated across both undergraduate and graduate curricula; 31 undergraduate departments fulfilled the General Education requirement for Global and Cross-Cultural Studies and/or had courses whose titles suggested content focused on other cultures. There is also a new Globalization Studies major, originally recommended by the President’s Task Force on Sweatshop Labor. The task force was formed in response to student activism over working conditions around the world. There are several other majors that offer international and multicultural studies as an integral part of the curriculum, including: Africana Studies; Anthropology; East Asian Studies; Art and Art History; Geography and Planning; Judaic Studies; Latin American, Caribbean and U.S. Latino Studies; Women’s Studies; Languages, Literatures and Culture (LLC); and Medieval/Renaissance Studies. The University also instituted a new minor in LGBTQ studies which spans several departments and whose courses include: gay and lesbian studies; classism, racism and sexism; sexual politics in Chinese history; anthropology of gender; and law, civil rights, and sexual orientation.

Using graduate course titles, found 36 departments that offer graduate courses on global topics. At the graduate level, especially, these are spread across the college and professional schools. In addition, several research centers offer opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students to participate in international and multicultural research, e.g., The Institute for Mesoamerican Studies, The Center for Social and Demographic Analysis, The Institute of Cypriot Studies, and the Center for the Elimination of Minority Health Disparities.
Of the students who responded to the 2008 Middle States survey, 12% were somewhat or very satisfied with available opportunities to pursue interdisciplinary majors/minors, and 38% were neutral or did not know how they felt. It is unclear whether the students in the second group had no interest in interdisciplinary study or no information. This would be a goal for advising, which will be discussed below. Only 3% of responding students currently in interdisciplinary majors/minors were somewhat or very satisfied with how well the program meets their needs.

It may take increased vigilance and creativity to preserve interdisciplinary strengths, such as the globalization major, during periods of economic downturn. Scarce resources have been noted by interdisciplinary departments in compact plans and self studies as an impediment to greater vitality and visibility. Yet global and interdisciplinary studies are important to the University’s mission. In addition, foreign languages are an important component of a global and liberal education, and the University should pursue mechanisms to strengthen students’ facility with other languages.

**Recommendation:**

- Future assessment of interdisciplinary opportunities should include questions about how the experience could be improved.

**Encouraging Cultural Diversity and Global Awareness in Student Learning and Activities**

In 2006, a grant from the Ford Foundation created a Difficult Dialogues network of faculty and instructional support personnel across campus to identify options for enhancing diversity in course content. The network generated more ideas than could be implemented because of budget constraints. Yet through focus groups, panel discussions and workshops given by outside experts, the Difficult Dialogues network provided instructors with practical and social support to help address the challenge of incorporating into course content the diversity of religious, racial, cultural and sexuality perspectives that are a cornerstone of a 21st century education. The network also instituted conversation cafes, where faculty and students get together in an informal setting to discuss important hot button topics. ITLAL collaborated with the network and continues to provide workshops and materials to help faculty develop course content that brings multicultural awareness and enhances sensitivity to the diversity of student backgrounds.

As noted in Chapter 7, Student Support Services, the University is a member of the National Coalition Building Institute, and each year UAlbany’s NCBI chapter does about a dozen training sessions for different departments and units. These include specific undergraduate and graduate classes at the request of professors. In spring 2009, a Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Advisory Committee was formed by the provost’s office and the Division of Student Success to identify and define concerns of the LGBTQ community. The committee will produce a final report with recommendations in spring 2010 that will go to the provost and the vice president for Student Success, as well as the president’s office.
Study Abroad

During the past decade, the University has intensified its global efforts under the leadership of the Office of International Education (OIE). The student body includes over 1100 international students from more than 95 countries. The OIE helps foreign students make the transition to life in Albany, offering a comprehensive orientation program, information about health insurance, housing, taxes, and visas, and a full program of social activities. The OIE also oversees a study abroad program that allows students to choose from more than 65 University programs and earn major, minor and General Education credit. Students also have access to more than 300 programs in more than 50 different countries through the State University system. As Appendix 9.2 shows, more than 200 students have studied abroad each year since 2001, with a high of 412 in 2008.

The academic rigor of study abroad programs is ensured by internal and external oversight. New study abroad partnerships, whether with an institute, another university, or just a private contractor offering courses overseas, are reviewed in the SUNY provost's office by the same office that reviews new campus-based programs. Courses taught by UAlbany faculty are approved in the same ways that new courses are approved by departments on campus. The Office of International Programs (OIP) has recently taken over faculty-led study abroad courses from the Office of Summer Sessions, and is creating a standard course approval form to ensure that quality of instruction for those courses will be as rigorous as what is required for a new course offered on campus. Each individual course for which a student receives credit in the major or minor is evaluated by the student's faculty advisor.

A strong majority (70%) of the students responding to the 2008 Middle States Survey said there are sufficient opportunities for study abroad, 54% think students can study where they want, and the vast majorities of those who went abroad report the programs to be of good quality. As was the case with off-campus internships, the availability of such opportunities does not indicate how these experiences contribute to student learning experiences. Moreover, while only 1% of student respondents say they think studying abroad is not very useful and 32% say it is very useful, the majority of students responding are not sure about the usefulness of international study. A clear pattern did emerge in responses to an open-ended question about whether there are barriers that prevent UAlbany students from going where they would like to study. Far and away, the primary perceived barrier is financial. Other perceived barriers included finding high-quality programs, trying to complete major and General Education requirements, limited offerings during winter and summer intercessions, and inadequate advising. Again, more systematic assessment of these experiences would provide specific evidence of the impact of these programs.

Recommendations:

- The University should develop a more systematic approach for assessing how study abroad programs contribute to students’ educational experience.

- Interviews with OIE personnel suggest that while some programs are so expensive that financial aid will not cover the cost, there are many that cost only the plane ticket and incidental expenses beyond the cost of studying at Albany. There are always students who cover all the usual costs of being an Albany student out of financial aid, suggesting that the
use of financial aid should not keep students from a period of study abroad. There are also students who study abroad multiple times and still graduate on time. Planning is essential to overcoming perceived problems with scheduling or requirements.

- OIP should work with departments to explore options for students to fulfill requirements while abroad. In addition, OIP should offer regular information sessions for representatives of departments so that advisors have up-to-date information, especially about the financial component.

Advising

The undergraduate curriculum can provide an excellent and coherent learning experience only when students are able to easily navigate their way through requirements and opportunities. Through effective advising, students are made aware of UAlbany’s many and varied programmatic opportunities and are given the support to realize these opportunities. Quality advising can enhance the student experience, increase retention rates, and improve student satisfaction.

Understanding that advising is integral to student success, an ad hoc task force on advising was formed in 2004 in connection with the Undergraduate Academic Council. The task force then made recommendations to the Faculty Senate which were adopted in November 2005. In its recommendation to the Senate, the UAC noted: “The University community as a whole has responsibility for ensuring that academic advising is provided as a coherent continuum of services that supports and facilitates a student’s progress through the various stages of the academic program, and his/her development as a self-directed learner and independent decision maker” (Appendix 9.3, Senate Bill No. 0506-04).

While external reviewers indicate that some programs in the sample advise their students very effectively, NSSE results indicate that there is definitely room for improvement. Review of the self studies suggests that large departments should be a beginning focal point for improved advising. Various models exist on campus, including having office staff or graduate students do routine advising. A model that might be considered by a number of departments is provided by the English department advisement office, which is supervised by a full-time professional staff member and staffed with one graduate assistant and two undergraduate interns each semester. The implementation of the developmental model of advisement advocated by UAC and adopted by the Senate requires time and care, and many faculty already feel overwhelmed by the advisement process. A central advisement office for larger departments would ensure consistent, quality advisement for all majors. In the Department of English, this centralization appears to have markedly improved the quality of curricular advising and freed up faculty for mentoring and other student-oriented activities, thereby improving student success and satisfaction.

Recommendation:

- The University should conduct a comprehensive assessment of departmental advising, including comparison to peer institutions that showed, based on the NCSE survey, more student satisfaction with advising. It is also recommended, following Senate Bill No. 0506-
04, that to the greatest extent possible more emphasis be placed on implementing changes and allocating resources in support of initiatives that improve the quality of departmental advising.

**General Education**

The General Education program is a key feature in advancing the University’s mission to provide high quality liberal arts education. As the rationale for the University at Albany’s General Education program explains, it “proposes a set of knowledge areas, perspectives, and competencies considered by the University to be central to the intellectual development of every undergraduate.” The program encapsulates goals of providing students with diverse perspectives and awareness of the global community and their role as citizens in it. The requirements include specific attention to active learning and critical oral, thinking, research and writing skills.

**Number and Variety of Courses for Timely Completion**

The General Education program at the University at Albany is expected to be an integral part of students’ academic experience, encompassing coursework from the time they begin their undergraduate degree to the completion of their major program. Students’ General Education coursework, together with their academic major and minor requirements, are a significant portion of their academic plan for graduation. The number, variety, and availability of General Education course options are critical to students’ timely completion of the degree. Moreover, the program needs to be flexible enough to accommodate a wide array of situations: highly-sequenced academic programs; traditional or non-traditional students; international students; and students whose plans include full-time internships, study abroad or joint degree programs with other colleges/universities.

The General Education program includes 15 separate learning requirements (Appendix 9.4). In addition to the SUNY-wide requirements for General Education, the University at Albany includes local campus requirements. Students graduating from UAlbany take one additional Natural Science and Social Science course, an additional course to develop their writing skills, satisfy their foreign language competency at the Beginning II level, and complete a campus-based requirement in Global and Cross-Cultural Studies and in United States Diversity and Pluralism. The SUNY-wide General Education program requires that students complete at least 30 credits of academic work. Most University at Albany students complete over 40 credits of coursework in the General Education program.

General Education course proposals originate in departments or programs, pass through college and school curriculum committees where appropriate, and are reviewed by the General Education Committee, which is a committee of the Undergraduate Academic Council. The composition of these committees is determined by the University Senate. It is the responsibility of the vice provost for undergraduate education and of the General Education Committee to ensure that course proposals meet the values and criteria of the General Education program. New course proposals must also be approved by the Undergraduate Academic Council of the University Senate. Revisions designed to qualify existing courses for the General Education program will be reviewed only by the General Education Committee.
There is universal application of the program requirements for students who enter as freshmen; students from every school/college and discipline share the General Education classroom and engage the same foundation. (By SUNY policy, transfer students may have requirements met at their prior institution, even if the requirement is less than the UAlbany requirement.) In this manner, the University at Albany has given first priority to the integrity of the General Education program as a key component of its liberal arts mission. The addition of local requirements in Global and Cultural Studies, Foreign Language, and United States Pluralism and Diversity underline the institution’s commitment to the preparation of informed global citizenship. Required coursework beyond the SUNY-mandated minimum in the Social Sciences and Natural Sciences ensures that students are amply exposed to the tools associated with the creation of knowledge and scientific standards for discovery, explanation, and critical evaluation.

The introductory courses of almost all disciplines satisfy General Education requirements as well as provide a gateway into potential academic major fields. Over 1,600 courses at UAlbany are designated as fulfilling at least one General Education requirement, and many satisfy more than one requirement. Every school/college and most academic departments offer coursework as part of the General Education program.

Table 9.4 reports the number of seats offered in each General Education category across the last four years and indicates the level of change in General Education seat availability. The data show that the supply of General Education seats has grown at a pace commensurate with changes in the undergraduate population. In most categories, the number of seats offered has grown, along with efforts across the institution to add courses that are appropriate to the General Education program. In a typical semester, the academic schedule includes more than 30,000 seats in which students can engage some element of the University’s General Education program.

Students recognize the place of General Education as part of the broad liberal arts foundation of their University at Albany experience. The 2008 NSSE asked students, “To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills and personal development in the following areas….acquiring a broad General Education?” The mean response was 3.1 among first-year students and 3.2 among seniors, with a top score of ‘4’ equivalent to “very much.” The contributions of the General Education program received the highest mean scores among the different dimensions of Educational and Personal Growth.

One key way in which the General Education program is integrated into and complements the more specialized knowledge within the diversity of academic programs is through the practice of allowing a General Education requirement to satisfy major or minor requirements. This flexibility allows students to obtain a broad-based introduction to the Liberal Arts while exploring their own interests. For example, students studying Biology can easily satisfy their Natural Sciences General Education requirement within the context of their major, but must take courses outside their major to complete most other requirements. Alternatively, History majors can satisfy their U.S. History, Europe, Regions Beyond Europe, and a few other requirements in the context of their major, but study elsewhere to satisfy the Social Science and Natural Science requirement. Thus, the program is designed to ensure a breadth of study consistent with the University’s mission of a strong liberal arts foundation.
Integration of General Education Skills and Major Study

As noted above, the fact that virtually all departments contribute to the General Education Program and that most introductory courses across the University are designated as fulfilling a General Education requirement reflects one level of integration of the program with students’ academic majors. However, beyond the disciplinary requirements, the General Education program is designed to embed the delivery of specific skills across the curriculum, including skills in writing, oral discourse and information literacy. In addition, the Mathematics and Statistics requirement functions as a skill in many disciplines. These competencies are best delivered in small classes and provide a key opportunity for students to practice and develop communication and reasoning skills essential to their chosen disciplines. The degree to which these requirements are also integrated into academic majors, however, varies across departments.

There are 760 approved writing courses (upper and lower) with some 50 academic departments and majors represented in that approved list. At both the upper and lower levels, these courses are usually small classes. In some cases, such as with Anthropology, Philosophy and History, departments offer opportunities for students to satisfy both the upper and lower-lever writing requirements in the major; and some, such as Biology, have required courses in the major that satisfy both levels of writing. Almost every major in the University offers a course or courses to satisfy the upper-level writing requirement, and most academic majors require that students complete the upper-level writing within the discipline. However, not all programs have that requirement and many do not offer enough seats to meet the needs of their majors, forcing students outside their core disciplines to complete their upper-level writing requirement.

The lower-level writing requirement is among the hardest General Education category to satisfy. There are too few courses and seats available. In the 2007 Report of the Provost’s Task Force on Undergraduate Writing Instruction, the central place of writing development within the University’s mission was emphasized, and it was noted that writing is a “cognitive and social process by which students come to know themselves and the world around them” and “a means by which students gain access to the academic discourses that characterize intellectual inquiry in postsecondary institutions” (Report of the Writing Task Force). The research conducted by the Task Force also revealed high levels of dissatisfaction with the writing curriculum among faculty across the campus; instructors often feel ill-prepared to teach writing and believe that students come to upper-level disciplinary coursework lacking basic preparation. The Task Force recommended that the campus establish a University Writing Seminar that would be required of all entering freshmen students and taken in the freshman year. Leadership transitions and a developing fiscal crisis at the University contributed to a tabling of the Task Force report. However, many reports document the concern over the state of writing instruction on campus. As a key component of the General Education curriculum, linking communication, critical thinking and disciplinary discourse, the institution should reconsider the recommendations of the Task Force.
Like the writing requirement, Oral Discourse courses are small and could be most easily delivered in conjunction with a senior seminar in the major. This requirement is not well integrated into many of the majors (there are 193 approved courses representing 39 degree programs) so that students often practice and develop their oral discourse skills in a non-major context. Finally, the Information Literacy requirement is the least well-integrated into major degree programs. The University Libraries developed two popular courses, Information Literacy and Information Literacy for the Sciences, that introduce students to resources for the research process and instruct on how to locate and assess information. The Department of Informatics also teaches courses that satisfy this requirement. Since both of these programs are particularly well-suited to meet the Information Literacy requirement, other academic departments might want to consider using them to meet their own students’ academic needs, if they are not already being met by the departments’ curricula.

The General Education program also includes a Mathematics and Statistics requirement; the disciplinary-specific implementation of this skill may be a model for how the skills discussed above should be implemented. Twenty-two different courses have been designated as satisfying this requirement, and while the majority of students meet this standard with a course in statistics or calculus from the Department of Mathematics and Statistics, there are applied statistics courses in sociology, psychology, business, criminal justice, and political science that attract students studying in those degree programs. In philosophy, majors satisfy this requirement with a required logic course. Indeed, most majors that include a statistics course require their students to complete it as part of the major.

To accommodate changes in SUNY-wide assessment practices, the academic programs that teach courses designated as fulfilling the Mathematics and Statistics requirement are currently engaged in translating how their distinct treatment of the requirement (e.g. logic, calculus) maps to the broad learning objectives of the category. Ultimately, assessment of these General Education learning outcomes will be tied more closely to these discipline-specific standards. This may be a model that oral discourse, information literacy and upper-level writing can follow in the context of either academic programs or more broadly conceived disciplinary perspectives.

The evaluations of students on the 2008 NSSE support the conclusion that these skills need more concerted attention in the General Education program and may well be better developed if folded into the smaller classes available within a student’s major. Their evaluation of the extent to which their coursework supported key areas — writing clearly and effectively, speaking clearly and effectively, thinking critically and analytically, using computing and information technology, and analyzing quantitative problems — were all below SUNY and Carnegie peers at statistically significant levels.

**Recommendations:**

- The University should explore whether each academic major should be required to develop coursework and offer sufficient seats in upper-level Writing Intensive sections to meet the needs of its own majors.
• The University should re-engage the Recommendations of the Task Force on Writing Instruction as soon as the resource environment supports the consideration of new initiatives.

• The Undergraduate Academic Council and the General Education Committee should examine different models for delivery of the information literacy and oral discourse requirement, including a closer alignment of this requirement with a student’s planned academic path.

Faculty Participation in the General Education Program

While the General Education curriculum has grown, the proportion of courses taught by tenured and tenure track faculty has declined. Indeed, a larger proportion of all the University’s educational offerings may be currently met by part-time adjuncts, graduate students, and non-tenure track full-time faculty. But as Table 9.1 indicates, in the spring 2008 semester 35.1% of the courses in the General Education program were taught by tenured or tenure track faculty. This proportion has declined steadily in the last several semesters. The fact that a little better than a third of the General Education coursework — largely introductory courses — is taught by full-time faculty may reflect the necessity of balancing the demands of graduate instruction with academic majors and the broader liberal arts curriculum. This may be a situation that warrants further attention.

Recommendation:

• Governance committees should discuss the current makeup of instructors in the General Education program and decide whether the mix of tenure track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, graduate students, and part-time faculty should be monitored — and, if so, by whom.

Major Advising and the General Education Program

The integration of General Education program requirements into a student’s major academic plan is achieved by giving students tools to help them plan and monitor their progress toward degrees. Mandatory advisement policy reflects the expectation that a student actively engages his or her progress and plans before registering for courses. Colleges and departments plan their schedules in light of their curricular responsibilities and student demand. The availability of General Education courses is monitored at the institutional level, using information on student and departmental plans.

Beginning in 2006, the academic Advisement Services Center has worked with the colleges and academic majors to produce Major Academic Pathways (MAPs), which incorporate all of a student’s General Education program requirements in a sequence specific to each academic program. In addition, the General Education Web page includes a more generic planning tool that provides students with an idea of when, during their academic planning, they should have completed each General Education category. Finally, each student has online access to their Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS) audit, an individualized report that charts their progress in completing their academic requirements, including their General Education requirements.
Appendices 9.5 and 9.6 provide examples of student MAPS for two distinct programs. These plans are among 87 distinct MAPS available to students pursuing the full range of disciplinary majors. They are available to faculty and students at the Advising Service Center’s Website (http://www.albany.edu/advisement/). They are introduced to all incoming students by their academic advisors and are used widely by departments in major advising. As the MAPS illustrate, successful completion of the General Education program may be more difficult for students pursuing specific academic programs — in particular, highly sequenced science programs and programs in the School of Business. Those supervising the academic programs that face particular hurdles are aware of this challenge; these programs bear the responsibility of advising students to plan effectively.

Institutional Planning

The DARS software is also used to inform academic planning at the institutional level. Tables 9.2 – 9.4 illustrate the information available. Table 9.2 aggregates the DARS audit information for all registered students and indicates the number of students with unmet General Education requirements in each class (e.g., senior, junior), separating transfer students from native students. Table 9.3 represents a snapshot of the General Education seats available in the proposed fall 2009 schedule. These tables illustrate key stress points in the General Education program and can be used to describe a variety of ways the campus has responded to the clearer informational picture these resources provide.

A Course Enrollment Management initiative organized by Academic Affairs developed these tools. A Course Availability Group, initiated by the Office of Enrollment Management and including personnel from Academic Advising, the Office of Undergraduate Education, and the College of Arts and Sciences, uses this information and the Schedule of Courses to supplement planned departmental offerings with General Education coursework. Table 9.4 is an example of how the data are used, combining knowledge of student majors and the expected size of the new freshman and transfer populations to project demand. On the basis of this information, more than 3,000 additional seats were added to the schedule of classes for fall 2009, with funding from the provost’s office supplementing departmental plans. While many of these seats are identified and defined in terms of their contribution to the General Education program, they are planned in light of students’ disciplinary major intentions. For example, given what is known from the degree audit about student intentions to pursue a degree in biology, the number of seats required in the introductory biology courses can be estimated and course sections added, if necessary.

Using the type of information reflected in Tables 9.2 and 9.3, the General Education Committee took an active approach to addressing some of the shortages. For example, in 2005 the General Education Committee targeted the Regions Beyond Europe, Europe, and Global Cross-Cultural requirements. In these areas, there were fewer seats and a higher degree of students who needed the requirements, with some likelihood that a single course could be used to meet the learning objectives in two categories. Using the Undergraduate Bulletin, an examination of the coursework used by other SUNY campuses to meet these requirements, and knowledge of the UAlbany curriculum, the committee asked academic departments to consider submitting specific courses for approval as part of the General Education program. Another effort focused on the upper-level writing requirement. Using these data at the departmental level, each academic
department was informed as to whether or not it was meeting the student demand for upper-level writing seats. Upper-level writing is one of the few General Education requirements broadly suited for completion in the major. More fine-tuned information about students in the major was helpful in encouraging some programs to develop or add upper-level writing courses.

Meeting the seat and course demands of the University’s local Foreign Language requirement is a continuing problem. As Table 9.2 shows, this is among the highest “unmet” General Education requirements of both freshman and transfer students at every academic level. UAlbany allows incoming students who receive a score of 85 or better on the New York State Regents exam to waive out of this requirement; this leaves the requirement with a remedial quality that falls heavily on those who were not successful in their language studies in high school. These students are seeking very specific General Education seats, most often the second semester of beginning Spanish. Every semester additional seats are requested from the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures to meet the needs of seniors attempting to graduate. (The rule that prohibits seniors from preregistering for 100-level courses necessitates a flurry of administrative action across the University to accommodate these students). To offset this demand, students are allowed to use post-matriculation transfer credit of a first semester language course to satisfy second semester course requirement. Arguably, this imposes a serious inequity on students who are not informed of this language loophole or who cannot afford to fill this requirement at another institution. At the same time, concerted efforts have been made by LLC and the Office of International Education to create innovative study abroad programs that students can use to satisfy their language requirements during the winter and summer sessions.

It should be noted that the General Education Committee and the Undergraduate Academic Council have passed or debated at least three major proposals to alter the character of the General Education program in the last four years. Each proposal has been partially motivated by a desire to reduce the size of the program and the number of requirements students must meet; each included a change in the Foreign Language requirement. The most recent of these proposals, soundly defeated in the Senate, called for an elimination of several of the local requirements of General Education program. Yet there remains some level of dissatisfaction, among faculty and students, with respect to the number of requirements and the resources available to expand seats in the General Education program.

It may be useful to ask the Undergraduate Academic Council to again consider whether the current Foreign Language requirement is appropriate the student population. A broader recommendation would be one that encourages more widespread consideration of the information presented here. The General Education Committee should regularly report the data presented in Tables 9.2 and 9.3 to the Undergraduate Academic Council for inclusion in its regular report to Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate. The findings may be more useful for University governance bodies in the evaluation of the General Education Program and allow a clearer reading of how widespread faculty support is for the comprehensive program.
Recommendations:

- The Undergraduate Academic Council should again review the University’s current Foreign Language Requirement in light of the University’s overall mission and goals and in the context of the entire General Education program.

- The General Education Committee should report the data discussed here annually to the Undergraduate Academic Council for more widespread faculty consideration.

Availability of Information on the General Education Program

Information regarding the General Education program has improved with widespread access to the Internet, but more could be done to help students become better informed about their options. The Undergraduate Bulletin includes a description of the General Education program, its rationale, and the substantive content associated with each of the categories. However, it no longer lists all of the General Education courses that satisfy requirements in a separate section. The size of the program and its dynamic nature relative to a static paper bulletin made that information outdated before it was widely available. Instead, the General Education Web page has a “lookup” function that is updated as a function of changes in the PeopleSoft catalog. For students, the General Education plan and sequencing information is prominently linked from the Advisement Services Center Website and included in all of their online registration tutorials.

Senate legislation requires that course syllabi include information regarding the General Education status of each course and the learning objectives associated with each learning requirement. Syllabi are collected by the General Education Committee and reviewed as part of the General Education Assessment Committee’s work; departments and faculty instructors are reminded of this necessity when the category in which they teach undergoes assessment, but this reminder might occur more regularly. Results from the 2008 Middle States Survey indicated that 21% of the students were dissatisfied with the information available to them about General Education courses in advance of their enrollment and 29% were neutral. If typical course syllabi were made available by departments on their Websites and long-term scheduling plans (discussed below) made more transparent, students could be better informed before choosing their General Education courses.

Recommendation:

- At the end of each semester, the General Education Committee should contact all instructors teaching General Education Courses in the following semester, reminding them of the appropriate information to include in their course syllabi.

Expanding Curriculum and Student/Faculty Petitions

The General Education program at University at Albany is flexible and dynamic. As a research campus, new courses and academic majors and minors are approved annually. When appropriate, these new opportunities are designated as part of the General Education program. In the last year,
the program has expanded to include courses from the College of Nanoscale Science and Engineering, the School of Public Health, the Documentary Studies program, and the Honors College. New faculty and expanded curriculum have added to the General Education curriculum such courses as the Politics of Southeast Asia, the Search for Life Beyond Earth, and Introduction to Bioethics. Table 9.5 provides a list of additions to the General Education curriculum submitted to SUNY system administration in the course of the last calendar year. The range of departments and schools/colleges represented in the table supports the finding that the General Education program is involved on an institution-wide level; 21 distinct departments and five schools/colleges added General Education courses in a single year. The table does not include more than 30 other courses that only need campus approval to satisfy a local requirement or to be offered in the categories of Writing Intensive, Oral Discourse, and Information Literacy.

The General Education Committee also reviews petitions from students who believe they have met a General Education requirement with a course outside of the designated curriculum. Well over 100 petitions are submitted each semester, a majority of which are granted. These petitions vary widely. The most commonly granted petition is from a student taking an upper-level course that clearly meets the General Education requirement but is not designated as such. Many of the categories of the General Education program are expected to be explored at the introductory level and many departments reserve enrollment in advanced courses for their majors; however, if a student takes an upper-level course that fits the requirement, the petition will be approved. Whenever possible, if a student petitions for a General Education requirement to be satisfied in a lower-lever course, whose syllabus reflects content well-matched to the category’s learning objectives, the exception is extended for all the students in the course.

Adopted by the General Education Committee in spring of 2007, this petition and exception process is relatively new. It represents an untapped informational resource on the effectiveness of the General Education program. While the General Education Committee does glean important anecdotal information about student perceptions from the requests it reviews, these impressions could be informed with better systematic data analysis. Moreover, both the availability of the petition option and the results of past requests need to be more widely publicized to students and faculty. Currently, departments agree to the changing General Education status of the course, the student who submitted a petition is informed, but all other students affected by the change would need to consult their degree audit to discover that a change in the course’s status had taken place. Sometimes these changes take place from a previous semester, making it impossible for a faculty member to notify students in a classroom setting of the change. Moreover, when a department declines the request to consider submitting a course to fulfill a General Education requirement, the General Education Committee does not ask again, nor does it approve subsequent petitions. Sometimes these requests come for very reasonable courses and the repeated requests take up everyone’s time needlessly. One recommendation, if enacted, would establish a central informational place, on a highly visible, well-trafficked page, that would inform students of changes in the status of courses, and increase student and faculty knowledge and understanding of the process.

In addition, the Office of Undergraduate Education works with and assists students in satisfying requirements when the program presents a barrier to graduation. For example, students with disabilities that present obstacles toward satisfying specific requirements — in particular, Math
and Statistics and Foreign Language — are provided with alternative courses; and students who can meet the Foreign Language requirement with proficiency in a language not reflected in the curriculum are provided an alternative means to demonstrate equivalency. The General Education Committee accepts departmental requests to designate one-time offerings of topical courses as well as individual faculty petitions which would allow work that individual students have done in upper-level independent studies, colloquia, or honors tutorials to satisfy General Education requirements. Study abroad work is very often accepted as part of a student’s General Education program.

Advisement by the Academic Advising Service Center and within a student’s major are key resources to assist students in understanding how the General Education program requirements complement academic programs. This planning is a major factor in determining whether students can complete all of their academic requirements and graduate in a timely manner; it is especially critical for students in more specialized, combined degree programs, where coursework within the academic program is sequenced.

Each academic program employs a longer time horizon for internal course scheduling than the schedule of classes makes apparent. If these longer range plans were more transparent to students and academic advisors, students would have better decision-making resources. Thus, one recommendation would be that each academic program make available on its Website its planned curriculum for the next two years, including the associated General Education status of designated courses. However, given the dynamic nature of course schedules, students would need to be well apprised of additions and deletions in those plans.

The University has no systematic data on the extent to which students are delayed from graduating because of General Education requirements. In the spring 2009 initial run of degree candidates, 560 out of 2,142, or 26.14%, were found deficient for some reason (e.g., not enough credits, GPA issues, missing requirements in their major, minor or General Education program). Of those 560, only 41, or 7%, were deficient solely on the basis of a missing General Education requirement. The Registrar’s office notifies the students and the Office of Undergraduate Education about these deficient degree candidates (it notifies the student and the academic program when the deficiency is a function of a student’s major requirements). The Associate Dean for General Education and the General Education Committee review the student’s academic record to try to resolve as many of the deficiencies as possible.

Results from the 2008 Middle States Survey suggest that the General Education program is perceived as a barrier to timely graduation by some students. Among the freshman through junior respondents, 4% reported they would be unable to complete General Education requirements on time and 20% were not sure. Of the seniors, 11% said General Education courses were a barrier and 7% were not sure. Respondents citing difficulty identified the number one barrier as a conflict between their major program and available General Education courses. The open-ended responses indicate that the restrictions surrounding course requirements in addition to lack of adequate advising were the primary reasons for difficulty in completing General Education requirements. Time, other non-school obligations, and difficulties meeting grade requirements were additional issues.
Recommendations:
- The General Education Committee should consider ways to publicize information from the petition and exception process.
- The data available from the General Education Committee’s petition and exception process should be analyzed more systematically and added to other informational resources being used to evaluate student demand and the General Education program requirements.
- Curriculum planning information that departments develop should be available to students so they can engage in better long-term planning.
- The General Education Committee should review the academic progress of students in highly-sequenced degrees or combined programs to evaluate whether their total requirements pose a hardship that should be modified to facilitate timely graduation.

Learning Objectives, Information Resources and Assessment

The learning objectives for the entire General Education program were defined in the Implementation Guidelines of the Provost’s Advisory Task Force on General Education. UAlbany learning outcomes and objectives were developed by focus groups of faculty teaching courses in a given category; the groups augmented the learning objectives (defined in the Implementation Guidelines) for that category. This enhanced set of objectives and outcomes was subsequently restated in the recent (2008) Triennial Update of Campus General Education Assessment Plans and Reports on Closing-the-Loop Activities; they are detailed in Appendix 9.6.

The learning outcomes and objectives are listed in the Undergraduate Bulletin and are available on the General Education Website (http://www.albany.edu/gened/). Faculty proposing new courses for the General Education program must explicitly address these learning objectives and incorporate them into the course syllabus. This information is accessible to faculty and both current and prospective students. Furthermore, the outcomes and objectives frame the evaluation questions presented to the students in the course assessment forms.

The General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC) has responsibility for:
- Reviewing the assessment methodologies employed in courses in their respective categories by examining the assignments and narrative explanations supplied by faculty along with the numerical data of outcomes; ensuring that assessment methods are reported for each objective; identifying effective and ineffective assessment methods; making concrete suggestions for improvement, wherever possible.

- Reviewing the report of the Director of Program Review and Assessment on the Student Perceptions of General Education Program Course Survey to identify strengths and weaknesses in each category; recommending areas in need of improvement in communicating the goals and objectives of the General Education program and its courses to students; reviewing the survey itself and making recommendations as to its continuance or discontinuance.
• Reviewing the locally developed learning objectives developed for their respective categories to determine if they are indeed assessable.

• Reviewing the relation of courses selected for assessment to those not chosen, in order to determine what problems, if any, would emerge from going to a system of random selection.

• Submitting an annual report on the General Education assessment to the General Education Committee and to the Council on Academic Assessment, which would summarize the committee’s findings and recommend policy and/or procedural changes based on assessment results.

• On the basis of its analysis of the assessment information, recommending for each course that it be: 1) continued for another three years; 2) revised in order to be continued; or 3) discontinued as a General Education course.

Support for Current Educational Offerings

The evolving nature of 21st century teaching and learning has changed expectations for instructional support. Academic and administrative instructional support units have endeavored to align resources and services accordingly. Key facets of educational support are library collections and facilities, instructional and classroom technologies, and faculty instructional support and development.

University Libraries

The University Libraries’ mission is to “strengthen and enhance the teaching, research, and service of the University at Albany. The Libraries promote intellectual growth and creativity by developing collections, facilitating access to information resources, teaching the effective use of information resources and critical evaluation skills and offering research assistance.” The Libraries support the University’s educational offerings through an extensive array of services, collections and facilities.

The University Libraries are housed in three buildings: University Library, Science Library, and Dewey Graduate Library. The University Library’s collections and services focus on social sciences, humanities, education and business, and the Science Library focuses on sciences and health. Dewey Graduate Library serves the four graduate professional schools on the Downtown Campus (Social Welfare; Criminal Justice; Information Studies; and Public Affairs and Policy). Each library houses collections and provides reference and circulation services. The Libraries’ staff comprises 72 FTE faculty, 49 FTE support staff, and 30 FTE student staff.

The Science Library is a modern facility, built in 1999, with sufficient wiring and data for PCs, group study spaces, adequate shelving space, and extensive storage areas. The busiest of the three libraries, the University Library, was built in 1965, and so predates modern technology; it has inadequate data, wiring, and HVAC, as well as other issues. Planning for its renovation began in spring 2008. Dewey
Library, built in 1909, has wiring and data connections that were upgraded in the 1990s and are currently sufficient. Compact shelving has made room for adequate study space.

The University Libraries collection supports research and study for faculty, students and researchers affiliated with the University. It includes books, journals, electronic journals, electronic books, databases, government documents, microforms, special collections, archives, software, CDs, DVDs, videos, and maps. The Libraries own 2,174,741 print volumes, 2,914,518 microforms and 77,390 e-books (including government publications); receive 39,005 print and electronic journals and serials; and subscribe to 297 databases. Virtually all electronic materials can be accessed from on or off campus 24/7.

The University Libraries Website is the research portal that provides access to the University Libraries’ collections and services. This is a complex site developed and maintained by Library Systems staff and a committee of public services librarians. It provides a gateway to all collections and resources including: the online catalog (Minerva); databases and online journals; services such as reference, tutorials, Interlibrary Loan and circulation; and news and information about the Libraries. The Libraries have extensive technical software, equipment and expertise to provide access to not only this complex Website, but to its online catalog and extensive collection of online journals and databases. The Technical Services and Library Systems Division acquires and arranges access to all information resources selected by the Collections Division in a user-centered, cost effective, and efficient manner. A “Journal Finder” (on the Website) and link resolver assist users in finding online journals and accessing the full text of articles. Features in the Minerva Online Catalog are continually reviewed and updated.

Collections are managed by 17 bibliographers whose subject expertise enables them to work closely with the teaching faculty in building collections that address research and curriculum needs. Library priorities and policies are documented in the Collection Development Policy. Bibliographers also provide in-depth reference assistance, make presentations to classes on library research topics, and prepare Web-based bibliographies and research guides in subject areas of interest to their assigned departments and programs.

The M.E. Grenander Department of Special Collections and Archives, a repository for manuscripts and archives of original research materials, provides students with opportunities to consult and study collections of primary source materials, some of which are internationally known. The Department’s most important collections are the Archives of Public Affairs and Policy, The German and Jewish Intellectual Émigré Collection, and the University Archives. The Department is actively engaged in digitizing selected collections related to the history of the University.

During the 2008-09 academic year, visits to the University Library totaled 890,897, the Libraries’ Website was visited 2,712,900 times, its 139 most heavily used databases were searched 1,533,064 times, reference staff answered 62,930 questions, users checked out 906,698 items, Interlibrary Loan borrowed 22,371 items from other academic libraries for UA students and faculty, and the Libraries’ intra-campus document delivery service delivered 12,691 items directly to library users. During the
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2 http://library.albany.edu
3 http://library.albany.edu/subject/cdp/
period before and during final exams, the University Library was open 24/7 during the week and 16 hours/day on weekends.

The Interlibrary Loan Department supplements the University Libraries’ collection by providing electronic article delivery and loans of books and other types of materials from a vast network of libraries on a local, statewide and international basis. State-of-the-art software is utilized to manage requests and deliver materials efficiently. Relationships with several consortia (SUNY libraries, ARL RAPID libraries, and Capital District Library Council libraries) enable the department to maintain cost effective resource sharing. The Preservation Department coordinates efforts to prolong the useful life of the University Libraries’ collections and the information they contain. An on-site storage facility houses nearly 340,000 volumes of less frequently used materials that are available by paging.

The Libraries are a hub of support for undergraduate and graduate students. Reference Services are available at all three libraries. The reference desk in the University Library is staffed up to 69 hours per week, with the Science Library and Dewey Library offering fewer hours. Service is also available by phone, e-mail, IM, and texting. Individual appointments with reference librarians and subject specialists are available for students and faculty who have more complex research projects. Reference services are analyzed according to difficulty of questions, time of day and week, and communication medium (i.e. in-person, IM, etc.). Staffing patterns are based upon this information.

Librarians play an important role in the campus-wide effort to teach students how to access and evaluate information, and how to use it ethically. The Libraries offer two one-credit courses that meet the University’s Information Literacy General Education requirement. While a decline in the number of librarians who teach these courses has had an impact on how many sections can be offered, 30 sections were taught in the 2008-09 academic year. Librarians also contribute to discipline-based instruction through course-related instruction, development of tutorials and guides, and individual consultation with students. The Libraries’ interactive tutorials include Plagiarism 101 (addressing a major campus concern), Researching 101, and Evaluating Internet Sites 101. For classes and tutorials see http://library.albany.edu/usered/.

The Interactive Media Center offers an array of multimedia and Web-design tutorials. This Center, unique on campus in assisting students to develop their competency with new media, was upgraded in 2008/09. It provides digitizing, equipment for loan, scheduled instruction, lectures to academic courses and an open lab with on-site consultation in the areas of audio and video digitizing and Web-development applications.

In addition to these services, librarians attend orientations for freshmen, graduate students, transfer students, international students, and parents. The Libraries’ largest outreach event, Library Palooza, is held on the opening weekend of each fall semester. In 2009, almost 1,500 students attended this event. Librarians also go “on the road” to residence halls to offer programming. Outreach is provided for transfer students by offering on-site programming and reference service in the transfer student lounge. The Libraries continually reach out to patrons through the Website, blogs, flyers, signs and handouts alerting patrons to research resources and processes, events and services. Each library has a large screen in its lobby where events, services and collections are advertised.

---

4 http://library.albany.edu/imc/
Each library has a coordinator for services to patrons with disabilities. Software and equipment for students with visual and mobility issues are available in each building and the Libraries provide copying, paging and retrieval, home and office delivery, as well as orientations and reference assistance for patrons with disabilities. These services are described in detail in the “Practical Guide to Library Services for Persons with Disabilities.”

The University Libraries have long been a welcoming gathering place for students to study and meet. There are varied settings in the Libraries, including designated quiet study areas, carrels, group study areas (some with white boards), comfortable seating areas, and the Information Commons (IC)\(^5\). The IC, a nexus of research assistance and computing resources, is a partnership between the Libraries and University’s Information Technology Services (ITS). This initiative provides resources that had not previously been available to such a degree in the University Libraries. Space within the Libraries was repurposed and the Libraries now house more than 550 public PCs that provide access to an extensive suite of software. The majority are owned and maintained by ITS. Library-owned laptops are available for checkout and students have access to networked and wireless printing and wireless access for laptops. The IC encourages and supports the knowledge-centered, student-centered, social, interactive, and technologic aspects of teaching and learning at the University. The Libraries and campus ITS have demonstrated sustained commitment to this partnership. A March 2008 IC Development Task Force report made several recommendations for developments of future phases of the IC.\(^6\) The Libraries have been following up on many of these recommendations as resources become available.

Libraries faculty strive to be aware of the constantly shifting landscape of library services — new technologies, new techniques, new online public access catalogs (OPACs), new directions from OCLC and library system vendors — as well as changing user needs and expectations. The Libraries have invested heavily in a more complex library management system, including a new OPAC and a new Interlibrary Loan system since the last Middle States team visit. Librarians and staff members have expended extensive time and effort to configure them to best meet student needs. They have also invested in providing new and innovative services. Recent examples from the Reference Department include implementation of IM Reference, Text Reference, and Just Ask! Service (students ask for reference assistance to come to them at the computer they are using).

The Libraries collect data to assess how well they are meeting student needs and to help improve services. Evidence from a number of surveys, including LibQual+, the 2008 Middle States Survey on Student, Faculty and Staff Satisfaction, and several internal library surveys, indicates that the Libraries are effective in informing users about available services and that users are largely satisfied with the services the Libraries provide.

The LibQual+ survey, developed by the Association of Research Libraries and used as a way to “benchmark perceptions of library services,” was administered to University at Albany faculty, students, and staff in 2006. A total of 538 people across many departments took the survey,

\(^5\) [http://library.albany.edu/infocommons/](http://library.albany.edu/infocommons/)
\(^6\) See [https://wiki.albany.edu/download/attachments/14191606/ic+dev+final+rpt.pdf](https://wiki.albany.edu/download/attachments/14191606/ic+dev+final+rpt.pdf)
including 127 undergraduates and 273 graduate students.\textsuperscript{7} Student responses show that the University Libraries meet the needs of students, but that additional information resources are desired, and that there are library hours, space, and computing issues that need to be addressed. For undergraduate students all three general areas — Affect of Service, Information Control, and Library as Place — are perceived as adequate, but below the desired level. Particular strengths included a willingness to help users, caring employees, community space for group learning, and modern equipment for information access. Strengths indicated through local questions added by University Libraries, related to providing online course support and teaching information literacy skills. The only areas rated inadequate were “Quiet space for individual activities” in Library as Place, and “Ready access to computers/Internet/ software” in response to a locally-developed question. For graduate students, issues of concern were more numerous, and clustered in the category of Information Control. Major weaknesses were access to print and electronic information sources (particularly journal collections), and having access to a Website that enables students to find information themselves. The only question outside of Information Control with a low score was “Library space that inspires study and learning.” Strengths included giving users individual attention, community space for group learning, and teaching information.

The 2008 Middle States survey of undergraduate students indicated that 58% of students felt the Libraries’ services were very effectively publicized, and another 26% felt services were somewhat effectively publicized. Fifty-one percent were very satisfied with the Libraries’ services and 28% were somewhat satisfied. Several comments expressed dissatisfaction with the hours that the libraries are open, particularly the Science Library.

**Recommendations:**

- The University Libraries should explore options to improve access to information for all University library users. Areas targeted for improvement would include online databases and other online materials (both fee-based and open-access), as well as ensuring availability of the staff necessary to process these materials and make them accessible to library users both on and off campus. Improving access also would include providing reference assistance to users in-person/online/by phone and teaching students how to make the best use of available resources.

- In order to obtain a more up-to-date picture of undergraduate and graduate student satisfaction and concern, an instrument similar to, but shorter than, LibQual+ should be administered on a regular basis. Particularly useful would be information about students’ preferred methods of learning about and accessing the resources provided by the Libraries, as well as their needs related to the Information Commons.

**Information Technology Services (ITS)**

ITS is a very strong source of curricula support, despite difficult economic times. Currently, ITS is working on a long range strategic plan (“ITS 2.0”) to provide continued service and

\textsuperscript{7} Complete survey results are available at http://library.albany.edu/about/libqual.html
maintenance of vital technology infrastructure, and to play a consulting and coordinating role for schools, departments, and divisions. In August of 2006, Faculty Technology Resources (FTR) was added as a support group within ITS to coordinate instructional technology resources and services, provide faculty with the tools needed to incorporate technology into their instruction, and to manage two major transitions: 1) deployment of a new course management system, and 2) conversion from an externally supported online learning platform to an internally hosted program.

**Classroom and Other Course Technologies**

Since 1999, 59 classrooms and lecture halls with a combined total seating capacity of approximately 7,273 have been equipped with computing technology, including seven computer classrooms equipped with workstations for each seat (201 student PCs total; average of 28 PCs per smart classroom) and 27 smart classrooms (Appendix CT provides equipment and software list). There is also a suite of applications, to support teaching, learning, research, and communication.\(^8\)

In spite of these improvements, demand is outstripping availability. In a spring 2005 evaluation, Client Support Services (ITS) found a high demand among faculty that all teaching spaces be minimally equipped with a computer and projector and that there be technology-assisted spaces for occasional instructional uses. Another indication of this increased demand is the increased use of a computer-on-wheels (COW), provided for use in non-computer classrooms. From spring 2008 to fall 2008, COW usage increased by 43%, from 128 to 183 class sessions. These figures likely underestimate demand, because insufficient staffing requires faculty to get and return the COWs. The University has equipped additional classrooms with technology each year as funding has allowed (six new classrooms were slated for summer 2009).

In 2007-2008, ITS/FTR and ITLAL collaborated to launch a pilot project for using student response, or “clicker,” systems. The project was cohort-based and resulted in roughly 24 instructors and several hundred students using the technology over the past two years. Surveys during the first cohort (fall 2007) indicated that, in general, students found the system was easy to use, beneficial to their learning, and its use worth the time and money. In general, instructors have responded favorably, and many have continued their use of the system. Survey data on the clicker project are available at the following links:

- Faculty surveys: [https://wiki.albany.edu/download/attachments/14191606/iClicker+Faculty+Surveys+Round+1.doc](https://wiki.albany.edu/download/attachments/14191606/iClicker+Faculty+Surveys+Round+1.doc)
- Student compiled responses: [https://wiki.albany.edu/download/attachments/14191606/iClicker+Compiled+Results+Survey+Round+1+Anonymous.xls](https://wiki.albany.edu/download/attachments/14191606/iClicker+Compiled+Results+Survey+Round+1+Anonymous.xls)
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\(^8\) [http://www.albany.edu/its/software_userrooms_classrooms.htm](http://www.albany.edu/its/software_userrooms_classrooms.htm)
Student open-ended responses:
https://wiki.albany.edu/download/attachments/14191606/iClicker+Open-Ended+Responses+Fall+2007+Round+1.xlsx

Outside the classroom, ITS has helped faculty stay current with other emerging technologies. For example, the 2007-08 instructional Wiki Pilot project resulted in a phased production implementation of the Confluence wiki service hosted on campus by ITS, beginning in 2008-09. From the beginning of the pilot, approximately 52 instructors used wiki spaces for 1,215 enrollments (duplicated headcount). Expanded usage using wikis will be facilitated as experience yields best practices for instructional and learning strategies. It will be important to provide learning opportunities for instructors to effectively use wikis in teaching.

Due to lack of interest, the 2007-08 Blog Pilot project resulted in a decision to discontinue the pilot and not move ahead with a production service; however, ITS/FTR remains receptive to any renewed interest in a University-supported blog service that might be initiated and is prepared to offer consultation on various externally available blogging tools and services. A podcasting pilot project (using iTunes U from Apple, Inc.) began in January 2009; evaluation will determine its potential efficacy, future needs and requirements.

Student perception of the Use of Computing Technology or Media Resources in Their Courses as reported in the 2008 Middle States Survey is only somewhat positive. On a five-point scale, the following mean ratings were received for the four items: Adequacy of Use of Technology or Media, 3.80; Ease of Use of Hardware, 3.87; Ease of Use of Software, 3.87; and Support for Use of Technology and Media in Their Courses, 3.76. The average mean was 3.83. The University should recognize efforts toward effective, facile processes, as well as techniques for integration of technology and media in the University’s educational offerings. Continued (perhaps expanded) dialogue through groups such as the Faculty and Student Advisory committees, the pertinent Faculty Senate councils and committees, and the academic and administrative instructional support units could better facilitate such emerging practices.

**Information Access and Online Modalities**

To facilitate online information access more effectively, augment traditional instructional strategies, and support online learning modalities, the University has employed course management system (CMS) technology; using WebCT and, later, Blackboard. Additionally, the My UAlbany Web portal allows students and faculty to access their enrollment services and course resources securely and reliably online. Between 1999-2000 and 2007-08, enrollment in Web-enhanced courses increased by 1,000% (from 5,000 to 55,150). In order to address student and faculty needs for course management, an investigation of the interoperability of Blackboard with electronic reserve systems is underway.

FTR has conducted faculty development activities through online self-paced courses, standard classroom workshops, and individual consultation. In 2007-2008, FTR offered 63 workshop events on various course management system features. Although feedback provided by attendees is positive, average attendance at these workshops is very low (roughly two).
As online course offerings steadily increase, the University continues to support faculty in developing and teaching online courses. All instructors scheduled to teach an online course for the first-time (usually 10-15 instructors annually) participate in the Online Course Development Seminar. This program strives to ensure quality course design and effective online pedagogy, which is expected to result in higher levels of student and faculty satisfaction and more effective teaching and learning outcomes. As an increasing number of undergraduate online courses are offered, departments are assigning more instructors to teach online. However, interviews with ITS personnel indicate that there is not a widely applied protocol for how new online courses are identified, instructors assigned, and support requirements determined. Consequently, online teaching assignments have not always synchronized with the availability of course-development support resources, and instructors must sometimes be turned away from already full programs due to resource restrictions.

While fully online courses may fill the needs of some students, considerations involving effective instructional design, pedagogy and learning, management of departmental resources, and applicability across the curriculum need to weigh into plans for offering online courses. It is possible that some disciplines are more readily adaptable for online learning than others. Perhaps courses that can rely on objective-based assessment would be more easily adapted to an online platform, while those relying on essays and discussions pose greater challenges.

**Recommendations:**

- The University must continue to invest in ITS to improve upon the excellent foundation that has been provided, despite difficult economic times. Key priorities include classroom technology (learning spaces) and instructional technology. Classroom technology should be established in all new classrooms and upgraded in all refurbished facilities; this effort would include software for classroom PCs and personnel who can provide support (as with Husted Hall, which comes online in 2010). Instructional technology improvements would involve resources for implementing extensions to Blackboard (the University’s CMS) in order to enhance communication and collaborative learning, and integrate rich media for engaging course content, data, and other campus systems to augment student assessment capabilities. This would entail added personnel to facilitate expanded development of blended and online courses; research on, and development and coordination of emerging technologies, including Web 2.0 and mobile learning; and infrastructure for storage and delivery of audio/video; and other rich media content.

- The University should attempt to enhance staffing to support instructional use of the computerized classrooms or Computers on Wheels (COWs).
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9 Section 496(a)(4)(B) of the HEA, as amended by the HEOA, and effective August 14, 2008, provides that an accrediting agency must require an institution that offers distance education to have processes through which the institution establishes that the student who registers in a distance education or correspondence education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the program and receives the academic credit. Consistent with this legislation, all UAlbany students who participate in such classes use secure login procedures for their online courses.
The FTR should investigate ways to increase faculty attendance at workshops by aligning learning opportunities with faculty schedules or bringing the instruction to groups of faculty (such as departments, new faculty, and the like).

Additional data should be collected to determine if there are ways to better identify student needs for online courses so that required courses can be planned more effectively for online offering.

A forum should be instituted for discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of online learning, including identification of best practices in online learning.

Data are needed from departments to assess resource obstacles to online course offerings. ITS should develop ways to help departments balance the potential “seat deficit” sometimes experienced when offering online courses.

Feedback on the wiki tool should be gathered through surveys of instructors and students.

The University should work toward academically effective and facile processes for integrating technology and media into the University’s educational offerings. Continued (perhaps expanded) dialog through groups such as the Faculty and Student Advisory committees that make recommendations to the CIO, the pertinent Faculty Senate committee(s), and the academic and administrative instructional support units, could better facilitate such emerging practices.

The Writing Center

The English Department's Writing Center Program was begun in the late 1970s as a faculty initiative. The Writing Center is directed by an English Department faculty member and staffed by graduate as well as undergraduate students, not necessarily from English. Unlike tutorial centers at other colleges and universities, which might focus on remediation or specifically serve first-year writing programs, the Department of English’s Writing Center is open to the entire University community. According to the director, for writers, the Center's process-based pedagogy emphasizes critical thinking and disciplinary and rhetorical self-awareness. Tutors offer feedback, support and encouragement, and benefit themselves, since tutorials offer opportunities to study and discuss a wide variety of writing forms and professional or disciplinary conventions. They also offer incentive for tutors to reflect critically on their own assumptions and writing practices. While its core functions are pedagogical, including tutorials, workshops and presentations to University classes and programs, the Writing Center also offers institutional and logistical support to students, faculty, and staff engaged in a broad range of writing, reading and performance projects, and actively promotes programs and events that enhance and elevate writing and literary culture both within the department and across the University.

In addition to ongoing Writing Center support for two student creative writing groups, recent program initiatives included the addition of an ESL consultant from the School of Education to the tutorial staff, and a significant upgrade of the Web design software and user-room computers.
In addition, the Center hosted the 2007 SUNY Council on Writing Annual Conference. Currently the Center is working on a Writing Center blog and some research and planning around the potentials and possibilities of online peer-writing workshops for advanced classes, as well as peer discussions which would focus on specific genres of creative writing, such as screenwriting, fiction writing, and poetry.

**Recommendation:**

- While the Writing Center collects data on tutorials and class visits conducted, the data have not been reviewed in recent years, perhaps ever. The Writing Center therefore should undergo a regular formal assessment process so that effectiveness of its practices and pedagogical principles may be gauged.

**Institute for Teaching, Learning and Academic Leadership (ITLAL)**

During the self-study process, ITLAL consistently emerged as a vitally important resource on this campus. Formerly the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, which was in operation during the most recent Middle States team visit, CETL was reconstituted and its mission and resources expanded in 2006-2007. The vice provost for undergraduate education asked for a nationwide search for a director and, under the new director’s leadership, the center became ITLAL, a vital hub of faculty development designed to serve as an agent for instructional innovation and transformation, instigating cultural change to put the student at the center of the educational experience. In its first year of operation, ITLAL built up a Website of teaching resources (reporting over 21,000 hits), initiated the Instructional Leadership Academies, continued management of multimedia digitization and Web streaming services (approximately 6,500 audio and video items hosted), implemented a midterm course survey service, launched two print-publication series on teaching at UAlbany, and initiated the clicker project.

Through these initiatives, along with individual instructional consultations with faculty, ITLAL has supported hundreds of faculty and graduate students, encouraging active learning, interactive experiences, and team-based learning approaches. Unsolicited positive feedback on ITLAL programming and services is documented on the ITLAL Website. Institute personnel also collect anonymous feedback from participants at each ITLAL workshop. ITLAL is quite new, so these data have not yet been fully analyzed, but the director plans to use them to improve services offered to faculty and graduate students.

FTR and ITLAL collaborate on periodic faculty development programs designed to encourage and support innovation using instructional technologies. The Instructional Leadership Academies include learning opportunities for Web-enhanced and blended learning course design (11 and 22 participants, respectively, in 2008-2009), teaching large classes (new in 2009), and development of teaching portfolios (10 participants). Most of these opportunities were initiated in 2008-09 and have provided a basis for their expansion. A model for faculty development is taking shape, whereby the two units will facilitate a phased program for uptake of the tools and techniques required by faculty for effective Web-enhanced, blended, and online teaching and learning. ITLAL’s move to a newly renovated location in spring 2009 will better accommodate its ability

---

10 [http://www.albany.edu/teachingandlearning/](http://www.albany.edu/teachingandlearning/)
to support faculty innovation in the 21st century, including providing increased computing resources and corresponding programming, and consultation for instructional design and pedagogic development.

**Responsiveness of Curriculum to Changing Needs**

The University has responded well to changing needs and opportunities that are presented by the changing demographics, abilities and needs of its students. This chapter has already discussed the importance the University places on preparing students for life and careers in the global community. This section discusses responsiveness in terms of student subpopulations and the provision of online learning options.

**Transfer Students and Non-Traditional Students**

Since the last Middle States accreditation review, the number of transfer students at the University has increased. Nearly half of the students who graduate from UAlbany have transferred to the University, most commonly from one of the community colleges or four-year campuses within the SUNY system. Transfer students face special challenges in meeting both General Education and major/minor requirements for graduation. As noted in Chapter 7, Student Support Services, the University created the position of Transfer Experience Coordinator in 2007 in response to a number of concerns about transfer students’ experience. The coordinator works with the student advisement staff and major departments to guide them in assessing whether students’ past coursework meets UAlbany requirements. Advisors in turn work individually with transfer students to evaluate their past coursework and to develop their plan of study.

An important resource for transfer students is the transfer equivalency data bank, which identifies courses at hundreds of other colleges and universities that are roughly equivalent to UAlbany courses and/or that meet specific General Education distribution requirements. Equivalents for upper-level courses required by most majors are also catalogued.

According to the 2008 Middle States (student) Survey, transfer students report highly varied experiences with transfer advisement services, with some expressing very position experiences and others fairly negative ones in comparison to their former college/university. Approximately 18% of transfer students reported that the advising here is somewhat or much worse than advising at their previous school; the survey’s open-ended questions elicited a variety of negative comments about the advising system and almost no positives.

A number of the transfer students would be identified as non-traditional students, i.e., students who are older than the typical college-aged (18 to 22 years old) student, and often are balancing college with parenting, work, or other responsibilities. Currently, the University does not have a specific location to meet the needs of these students, and so it is difficult to examine how the University approaches the needs of these groups. Responses to the 2008 Middle States (student) Survey indicate these students do have some unmet needs. Some students noted the need for better advisement, more flexible and variable class schedules and office hours and other related services; some pointed to the difficulty in getting to advisors during office hours or getting other help from University personnel because of the limited times when they can get to campus.
Historically Underrepresented Students

As the NSSE results show, the University has a much higher share of students from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups as well as first-generation college students. The University at Albany, which defines itself in its “Principles for a Just Community” as “an academic community dedicated to the ideals of justice” and the principles of diversity, has been successful in reaching out to non-traditional students with diverse social backgrounds and low income. Undergraduate programs such as the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), Project Excel, Collegiate Science Technology Entry Program (CSTEP), the University at Albany Summer Research Program (UASRP), and Science & Technology Entry Program (STEP), will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter 10, Related Educational Activities.

At the graduate level, the State University of New York Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (SUNY AGEP) “provides an important means of access to qualified underrepresented minority students who are interested in graduate study and careers in the professoriate in science, engineering, and mathematics. SUNY AGEP seeks to enrich students’ academic experience by creating an effective network of faculty, students, and administrators who embrace academic excellence and diversity.” SUNY AGEP is funded by the National Science Foundation’s Alliances for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (http://www.albany.edu/agep). Among the services offered are: mentoring by the AGEP program staff; the Summer Research Institute for undergraduates; summer head-start for incoming graduate students; travel to professional conferences; financial incentives; faculty mentoring; book allowance, business card, student membership in professional organizations, campus visits, and stipend supplement.

Students with Disabilities

Students with disabilities are served by The Disability Resource Center (DRC), which provides educational programs and activities to enhance students’ development and well-being, and to create an inclusive environment that celebrates diversity, engagement, and learning. The DRC works with all members of the University community from faculty to alumni. In 1980, 88 students were registered with the office now known as the Disability Resource Center. In 2000, there were 340 self-identified students with disabilities. In the fall of 2006 there were 565 and in the fall of 2007, 575. This growth can be attributed to UAlbany’s commitment to diversifying the student and faculty bodies to advance scholarship and foster a more global learning environment. This growth also reflects the impact of the Americans with Disability Act (ADA) and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 which made the public more aware of their rights and their needs. The office’s Website states that students who are documented to have “any recognized disability or condition that causes a substantial limitation in a major life activity” can receive services. Chapter 7, Student Support Services, provides additional information about the DRC.

Online Learning

Between the summers of 2006 and 2008, enrollment in undergraduate online courses grew by a total of 185%, from 200 to 570. Online offerings during winter session began in 2007 and
continued in 2008 with an enrollment increase of 73%, from 170 to 290. While these trends point out the success of the online initiative, further analysis suggests that offerings may not be meeting demand. Since 2007 the number of students on the waiting list for online courses in the summer and winter terms has increased by 477% for summer and 73% for winter, from 80 to 462 and 256 to 443, respectively. In an effort to avoid putting students in a position of getting a late start on their course work in the time-compressed summer/winter terms, current policy prohibits adding students after the term has begun. Since some students drop courses after the term has begun, and those slots cannot be filled, total enrollment for the summer/winter term is on average 21% below the total enrollment cap for all courses in the term, while there is a waiting list that is 85% of the total term enrollment cap.

At the graduate level, online courses extend the University’s reach to students with full-time careers, both locally and outside this area. Examples include teachers or local health department staff in distant parts of the state who need additional education in their field but cannot relocate to pursue a full-time in-person degree. Some of the graduate students in online courses are full-time, local students, taking a few online courses to increase their time flexibility, experience a different learning approach, or take specific courses that are only available online.

Fully online learning poses challenges in student retention and advising. Students may take an online course assuming it will be easy. Yet because online learning requires greater student engagement in learning, it may be more challenging than in-class learning. The importance of advising is reinforced once again. Effective advising is needed to help ensure that students have appropriate expectations.

Recommendations:

- The Transfer Experience Coordinator should work with the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness to identify appropriate means to examine transfer students’ educational experience on a regular basis.

- Systematic data should be collected from both historically underrepresented students and non-traditional students in order to improve their college experience. The University needs to know the extent of difficulties and elicit suggestions to improve the college experience of these groups.

- The University should consider ways to provide more online options for students, including more sections of high-demand courses, e.g., by preparing more instructors for online education, developing innovative teaching-load or compensation options to permit instructors to develop online courses; or increasing the enrollment cap where feasible (because of experienced instructors, more efficient teaching strategies).

- ITS/FTR and ITLAL personnel should do presentations or provide advising material for departments to ensure effective guidance about online courses. This should include suggestions for advising distant students, which poses special challenges because it must be done via telephone or online.
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Appendix 9.1 Summary of Recommendations

- Faculty should be encouraged to discuss how graduate quality is being assessed; the correlation between productivity and quality should be examined, and the possibility of collecting internal data that assess other possible dimensions of quality evaluated.

- The University should develop a more systematic approach for assessing how internship programs contribute to students’ educational experience.

- Because clearly defined goals and linked assessments are important to student learning, it is recommended that the University consider requiring they be included on the syllabus of every course at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

- Systematic data should be collected on faculty perspectives about assessment, including how best to assess learning in faculty’s courses and disciplines.

- Regarding large courses, analysis by department of faculty-student ratios and teaching effectiveness should be carried out to ensure that quality of instruction is not compromised and that the faculty-student ratio be maintained, or even decreased, despite increasing enrollments.

- Because undergraduate instruction depends increasingly on adjunct labor, the University should undertake a review assessing: hiring practices; greater support and mentoring; systematic reporting of degree data; and a formal departmental evaluation process. The review could also examine the possibility of creating a category of “tenured instructors,” which exists at other SUNY institutions, as a way to offer stability to those upon whom the University relies so heavily for teaching, while providing these instructors with greater purpose as they serve this institution.

- A committee should be convened to gather systemic data from departments about how well graduate students are being prepared to teach effectively and to balance teaching and their own learning responsibilities. The committee could also identify best practices, such as graduate co-teaching internships, and make suggestions for campus-wide and departmental changes, keeping in mind faculty workload and resource issues.

- The University should examine how encouragement and resource availability for curricular/instructional development could be enhanced. Departments should be enabled to assign resources to develop and implement new courses or innovations to compensate for the time faculty must expend.

- The University should develop a more systematic approach for assessing how study abroad programs contribute to students’ educational experience.
Future assessment of interdisciplinary opportunities should include questions about how the experience could be improved.

OIP should work with departments to explore options for students to fulfill requirements while abroad. In addition, OIP should offer regular information sessions for representatives of departments so that advisors have up-to-date information, especially about the financial component.

The University should conduct a comprehensive assessment of departmental advising, including comparison to peer institutions that showed, based on the NCSE survey, more student satisfaction with advising. It is also recommended, following Senate Bill No. 0506-04, that to the greatest extent possible more emphasis be placed on implementing changes and allocating resources in support of initiatives that improve the quality of departmental advising.

The University should explore whether each academic major should be required to develop coursework and offer sufficient seats in upper-level Writing Intensive sections to meet the needs of its own majors.

The University should re-engage the Recommendations of the Task Force on Writing Instruction as soon as the resource environment supports the consideration of new initiatives.

The Undergraduate Academic Council and the General Education Committee should examine different models for delivery of the information literacy and oral discourse requirement, including a closer alignment of this requirement with a student’s planned academic path.

Governance committees should discuss the current makeup of instructors in the General Education program and decide whether the mix of tenure track faculty, non-tenure track faculty, graduate students, and part-time faculty should be monitored — and, if so, by whom.

The Undergraduate Academic Council should again review the University’s current Foreign Language Requirement in light of the University’s overall mission and goals and in the context of the entire General Education program.

The General Education Committee should report the data discussed here annually to the Undergraduate Academic Council for more widespread faculty consideration.

At the end of each semester, the General Education Committee should contact all instructors teaching General Education Courses in the following semester, reminding them of the appropriate information to include in their course syllabi.

The General Education Committee should consider ways to publicize information from the petition and exception process.
• The data available from the General Education Committee’s petition and exception process should be analyzed more systematically and added to other informational resources being used to evaluate student demand and the General Education program requirements.

• Curriculum planning information that departments develop should be available to students so they can engage in better long-term planning.

• The General Education Committee should review the academic progress of students in highly-sequenced degrees or combined programs to evaluate whether their total requirements pose a hardship that should be modified to facilitate timely graduation.

University Libraries

• The University Libraries should explore options to improve access to information for all University library users. Areas targeted for improvement would include online databases and other online materials (both fee-based and open-access), as well as ensuring availability of the staff necessary to process these materials and make them accessible to library users both on and off campus. Improving access also would include providing reference assistance to users in-person/online/by phone and teaching students how to make the best use of available resources.

• In order to obtain a more up-to-date picture of undergraduate and graduate student satisfaction and concern, an instrument similar to, but shorter than, LibQual+ should be administered on a regular basis. Particularly useful would be information about students’ preferred methods of learning about and accessing the resources provided by the Libraries, as well as their needs related to the Information Commons.

Information Access and Online Modalities, Writing Center, and other Aspects of Educational Offerings

• The University must continue to invest in ITS to improve upon the excellent foundation that has been provided, despite difficult economic times. Key priorities include classroom technology (learning spaces) and instructional technology. Classroom technology should be established in all new classrooms and upgraded in all rehabbed facilities; this effort would include software for classroom PCs and personnel for providing support (as with Husted Hall, which comes online in 2010). Instructional technology improvements would involve resources to implement extensions to Blackboard, the University’s CMS, in order to enhance communication and collaboration aspects of learning, integrate rich media for engaging course content, data and other campus systems for robust student assessment capabilities; this would entail added personnel to facilitate expanded development of blended and online courses; research on, and development and coordination of emerging technologies, including Web 2.0 and mobile learning; and infrastructure for storage and delivery of audio/video; and other rich media content.
• The University should attempt to enhance staffing to support instructional use of the computerized classrooms or Computers on Wheels (COWs).

• The FTR should investigate ways to increase faculty attendance at workshops by aligning learning opportunities with faculty schedules or bringing the instruction to groups of faculty (such as departments, new faculty, and the like).

• Additional data should be collected to determine if there are ways to better identify student needs for online courses so that required can could be planned more effectively for online offering.

• A forum should be instituted for discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of online learning, including identification of best practices in online learning.

• Data are needed from departments to assess resource obstacles to online course offerings. ITS should develop ways to help departments balance the potential “seat deficit” sometimes experienced when offering online courses.

• Feedback on the wiki tool should be gathered through surveys of instructors and students.

• The University should work toward academically effective and facile processes for integrating technology and media into the University’s educational offerings. Continued (perhaps expanded) dialog through groups such as the Faculty and Student Advisory committees that make recommendations to the CIO, the pertinent Faculty Senate committee(s), and the academic and administrative instructional support units, could better facilitate such emerging practices.

The Writing Center

• While the Writing Center collects data on tutorials and class visits conducted, the data have not been reviewed in recent years, perhaps ever. The Writing Center therefore should undergo a regular formal assessment process so that effectiveness of its practices and pedagogical principles may be gauged.

Responsiveness of Curriculum to Changing Needs

• The Transfer Experience Coordinator should work with the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness to identify appropriate means to examine transfer students’ educational experience on a regular basis.

• Systematic data should be collected from both historically underrepresented students and non-traditional students in order to improve their college experience. The University needs to know the extent of difficulties and elicit suggestions to improve the college experience of these groups.
• The University should consider ways to provide more online options for students, including more sections of high-demand courses, e.g., by preparing more instructors for online education, developing innovative teaching-load or compensation options to permit instructors to develop online courses; or increasing the enrollment cap where feasible (because of experienced instructors, more efficient teaching strategies).

• ITS/FTR and ITLAL personnel should do presentations or provide advising material for departments to ensure effective guidance about online courses. This should include suggestions for advising distant students, which poses special challenges because it must be done via telephone or online.
Appendix 9.2 Study Abroad Enrollments

Number of Albany students who went abroad and where they went.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Central Amer/Car.</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Middle East</th>
<th>North America</th>
<th>Oceania</th>
<th>South America</th>
<th>Yearly Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0001</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0102</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0203</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0304</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0405</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0506</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0607</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0708</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0809</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>2792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % 00-09 | 4.30%  | 15.11% | 4.26% | 60.60% | 1.93% | 0.72% | 6.91% | 6.16% | 100.00% |
| % 08-09 | 3.92%  | 18.80% | 8.62% | 49.87% | 3.13% | 0.52% | 2.35% | 12.79% | 100.00% |

*It’s too early to have confirmed 08-09 data but the numbers are fairly accurate.
Appendix 9.3 Senate Bill No. 0506-04

UNIVERSITY SENATE
UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Introduced by: Undergraduate Academic Council

Date: November 21, 2005

POLICIES AND PRACTICES CONCERNING
UNDGRADUATE ACADEMIC ADVISING AND MENTORING

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED THAT THE FOLLOWING BE ADOPTED:

1. That the attached “Proposed Policy on Academic Advising” be adopted as University policy and that the philosophy and definition of advising and mentoring contained therein be endorsed by the University.

2. That these policies be forwarded to the President for approval.

Rationale:

In 2004, an ad hoc Task Force on Academic Advisement was formed in consultation with the Undergraduate Academic Council to develop a framework for academic advising at the undergraduate level – a University-wide shared understanding of, and vision for, academic advising that reflects the many practices of academic advising across the University. The Task Force’s goal was to inventory current practice; to formulate a coherent set of policies that emerged from that practice where possible, i.e., to make explicit what has been implicit, or develop recommendations where practices vary; and to identify ways to improve the experience for advisors and advisees.

The Task Force met weekly from July through October and made its initial report to the Undergraduate Academic Council in November 2004 and offered a draft policy statement. The Task Force report also included a series of areas for improvement in practice that its members continue to work on, in consultation with the UAC.

The Task Force recognized a major impediment to effective academic advising is the scarcity, or perceived scarcity, of seats in many courses. Limited course availability often makes building a schedule a difficult task; it prevents students from enrolling in courses discussed with advisors; and finding an open course that “fits” and meets the students’ requirements consumes much “advising” time that could be spent more productively on other matters. The Task Force concluded, however, that resolving the issue of course availability would require a far more extensive examination than it was able to provide. The Task Force raised the issue to UAC to
encourage faculty and administration to explore ways to address this characteristic of the undergraduate experience at Albany.

The Council has carefully reviewed both the report and recommendations of the Task Force and has solicited and considered faculty feedback concerning that document. The following policy on academic advising codifies and clarifies many extant practices. Particularly in view of current concerns about student satisfaction, course availability, and retention and graduation rates, the UAC asserts that these recommendations are timely and important.

The policy has also been modified in response to comments offered by the University Planning and Priorities Committee. A joint committee, composed of members of UAC, UPPC, and task force members, met during the summer to review and revise this proposal to respond to both policy and resource and implementation questions.

I. POLICY

A. DEFINITION AND PURPOSE OF ACADEMIC ADVISING

Academic advising at the University at Albany represents a vital component of the undergraduate program that encourages a student’s active engagement in his/her education, supports his/her development as a self-directed learner and independent decision maker, and promotes participation as a member of the University’s learning community.

The principal objectives of academic advising are to provide guidance to the student that promotes: 1) intellectual development and engagement; 2) awareness of the range of academic and co-curricular opportunities available; 3) understanding of the requirements and development of a plan to complete a degree; 4) development of self-direction and independent decision making; and 5) awareness of post-graduation careers and opportunities appropriate to the degree.

Academic advisement is mandatory for students each semester in order to register. Before providing access to course registration to a student, each academic advisement unit must ensure that it has met its responsibility to provide advisement to the student as outlined below.

B. RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACADEMIC ADVISING

Each academic department has responsibility for advising students with declared majors in their disciplines. This responsibility includes ensuring that each student understands the courses in the major as well as sequencing, grade point average, and special circumstances that comprise requirements for successful completion of the major; and requirements of the minor and General Education, as well as overall graduation requirements. Each department must also ensure a student is apprised regularly of his/her progress in meeting these requirements. Toward these ends, academic departments must develop routine and effective procedures for monitoring a student’s progress through the degree program and create contexts in which this information is communicated so that a
student has time and opportunity to make the best decisions about how to satisfy the technical requirements for completing the degree.

The Advisement Services Center and the Educational Opportunity Program (for academic advising of EOP students) have the primary responsibility for the advising of students prior to declaration of a major. This responsibility includes developing effective methods for supporting a student’s transition into the University at Albany, and his/her growth and development as a self-directed learner and independent decision maker, as well as providing information about University requirements, including General Education, major, and minor. Further, this responsibility includes assistance with major and career exploration, information about various major options, information about enrichment opportunities within the University, use of the University tools and resources that support academic progress, and remediation or special assistance. These units also bear responsibility for ensuring students’ progress toward one or more majors and minors and for creating contexts in which information is communicated so that a student has time and opportunity to make the best decisions about his/her educational program. These units are also responsible for facilitating contacts of advisees with faculty and other department-based resources as appropriate to the student.

The University community as a whole has responsibility for ensuring that academic advising is provided as a coherent continuum of services that supports and facilitates a student’s progress through the various stages of the academic program, and his/her development as a self-directed learner and independent decision maker.

The Undergraduate Academic Council is the governance body with oversight responsibility for policies related to academic advising. School/college deans and academic administrators are responsible for ensuring compliance with these policies.

C. STRUCTURE OF ACADEMIC ADVISING AND MENTORING

In fulfilling the responsibility to provide academic advising to students, a department may establish structures and procedures and strategies that best fit its resources and curriculum, while accommodating the needs of all advisees. Each department will provide academic advising of new students, both freshmen and transfers, during scheduled planning conferences, as required.

Every department will provide the opportunity for contact with an advisor for every student each semester and will include opportunity for the following:

**Academic Advising**
- Discussing each student’s academic plan and goals
- Using the University’s Degree Audit, reviewing the student’s progress toward degree, including major, minor, and General Education requirements
- Reviewing semester course selection, including evaluating whether course load and course choices are appropriate for the student for each given semester
- Reviewing the student’s overall plan for future semesters, especially for programs with specific timetables, and plans for summer study at UAlbany or elsewhere
• Reviewing plans for improving academic success for students on academic and terminal probation.
• Reviewing, discussing and signing off on Academic Improvement Form as necessary
• Advising the student on coordinating General Education, minor, unrestricted elective courses and extracurricular activity choices with the major, career, lifelong satisfaction and other interests as appropriate

**Academic Mentoring**

Beyond technical administration of the major, academic departments also bear responsibility for addressing the needs of students for growth and development, i.e., for mentoring and career advice, such as special research and learning opportunities, honors programs and accelerated degree options; independent study, interdisciplinary opportunities, professional academic or artistic organization chapters or career clubs, research, internship, study abroad options, and career or graduate school options, and for participating in the community of learners; for recognizing demonstrated potential for honors, national scholarship competition and other relevant special opportunities and giving or referring the student to mentoring for them as appropriate; and for remediation or special assistance.

While advising and mentorship are provided by both academic professionals and teaching faculty, and can occur in many different settings, academic mentorship is a special responsibility of the teaching faculty.

**Advising in General Education**

The University’s General Education program has been established as a four-year experience required of all students (including transfer students). It is the responsibility of all advisors to have basic knowledge of the General Education program structure and requirements and to ensure that advisees are making progress in completing requirements.

Responsibility to advise freshmen and other pre-majors in the purpose, structure, requirements, and options for General Education rests with advisors in the Advisement Services Center and Educational Opportunity Program and should occur early in a student’s University career. For declared majors, including transfer students, academic departments will provide ongoing monitoring of progress toward meeting General Education requirements using the Degree Audit Report. Substantive questions regarding course equivalents for General Education and access to General Education courses are the shared responsibility of the Office of Undergraduate Studies and the department in the disciplinary area of the course.

**Advising in Minor or Second Major**

University policy requires that all students have a minor or second major (except students in combined major-minor or similar programs). Responsibility for advising regarding the minor or second major is as follows: 1) the primary department has responsibility to provide basic information about the requirements for a minor or second major, and for ensuring that students make progress in completing these requirements; and 2) the
department offering the minor or second major has responsibility to address substantive questions regarding course content, sequencing, etc., as well as providing access to courses.

**Assessment**

For the purpose of improving academic advising, University-wide surveys of the student experience should measure student satisfaction with academic advising and report to the University community via the deans and governance bodies. In addition, each department or unit should make provision to measure student satisfaction with advising in connection with the academic program review for the purpose of improvement.

**Recognition and Reward**

Participation in academic advising and mentoring activities by faculty and professional staff must be recognized and rewarded by the University and by the academic and administrative units to the greatest degree possible. In addition to the number of students advised, the University Faculty Activity Report shall include, in the section for Teaching, a line item for a narrative report of Advising and Mentoring Activities.

Departments are also expected to include information on individual faculty advising activity as part of the review processes for renewal, promotion and continuing appointment, discretionary increases and appropriate departmental, college and University recognitions and awards.

**D. STUDENT RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACADEMIC ADVISING**

Each student is expected to be an active participant in academic advising, just as he/she is expected to be an active participant in his/her education. While it is the responsibility of the department to ensure that students receive accurate and timely assistance in choosing courses and in developing and implementing an academic plan, it is ultimately the responsibility of each student to ensure that he/she understands and is actively engaged in monitoring his/her academic progress in order to plan, undertake and qualify in a program of study in order to graduate under the academic regulations of the University.

Early in the academic career, a student is expected to focus on becoming acquainted with the requirements of the academic program, including policies and procedures, and to master the tools that support active participation in his/her academic progress (including the use of the Undergraduate Bulletin, the degree audit, and the student registration system).

As a student advances through the academic program, he/she is expected to assume responsibility for acquiring the information needed to complete the degree requirements, and for preparing for academic advising sessions by reviewing the degree audit, formulating questions, and developing preliminary plans for the semester and beyond. Additionally, each student is expected to follow up on referrals made by advisors. A student experiencing academic difficulty is expected to meet with his/her academic advisor to discuss the details of a plan for academic improvement.
A student who transfers from another institution directly into a major must be given early opportunities to become familiar with the policies, procedures, and tools that support their academic progress at the University at Albany.

E. INFORMATION RESOURCES FOR ADVISORS AND STUDENTS

Information Resources for Advisors in Support of Academic Advising
A dynamic educational environment such as the University at Albany requires that academic advisors have access to a wide range of information resources and tools as well as opportunities to enrich their ability to deliver academic advising. Development and maintenance of these resources to help students and advisors meet their responsibilities will be the responsibility of the Advisement Services Center and the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. To the greatest extent possible, Academic and administrative units are expected to collaborate to develop and share such resources through electronic and paper means.

Information Resources for Students in Support of Academic Advising
Similarly, the responsible departments and units shall provide for their advisees the necessary information resources and tools to support their academic participation in their academic advising. The Advisement Services Center will provide resources for entering students.

F. ONGOING OVERSIGHT
As the governance body with responsibility for policies related to undergraduate academic advising, the Undergraduate Academic Council and the provost shall convene an advisory board to monitor University-wide implementation of this policy, to provide feedback and advice to academic departments and other units that deliver advisement services, to monitor and verify that the information resources for faculty and students fully support effective advising, to review and encourage assessment for the purposes of improvement, and to further explore and promote methods to improve and enhance advising. The board will provide an annual report to UAC, the Deans, and the provost regarding the state of advising at the University.

II. IMPLEMENTATION AND RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

A. RESOURCES FOR ADVISING
As this policy codifies and clarifies much extant practices related to academic advising, the resources that each department or advising center currently devotes to academic advising represent a baseline resource investment.

If academic departments and advisement centers conclude that current resources are not sufficient to meet their obligation to provide effective academic advising, or if they seek additional resources to improve their advisement services, existing budgetary mechanisms should be employed. Among the options academic units may consider as they seek to enhance their academic advising resources:

- Encouragement and recognition of teaching faculty involvement in advising as a departmental service or teaching contribution or University service contribution
- Reallocation of resources (e.g., staff and instructional resources) to advising
- Allocation of resources to support stipends for 10-month faculty fulfilling academic advising responsibilities in the summer
- Petition through the School/College resource allocation process for additional advising resources to the department
- Petition through the University’s budget allocation process for additional advising resources to the department or School/College

The resources necessary to prepare the University-wide advising information materials will be supplied within the current staff of the Advisement Services Center and the Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. The Advisement Services Center will also ensure ongoing training opportunities for faculty and staff on elements of the undergraduate program.

Resources in the form of expertise and assistance are also necessary to support the preparation and maintenance of advising information resources in academic departments, both print and electronic. These may be provided by Advisement Services, Undergraduate Studies, CETL and/or ITS.

B. ONGOING ACTION ITEMS

It has been suggested that there are structures and policies that increase the demands on academic advising resources. The Advisement Task Force has already begun to address the following issues, and the advisory board described in this policy will be charged to review these as well as other issues it identifies, and develop recommendations to address them:

- Examination of the resources currently devoted to academic advising in academic departments and development of a recommended standard (e.g. ratio of advisees to teaching faculty member, or advisees to full-time professional advisor) and possible incentives
- Alternatives to the traditional face-to-face meeting each semester to achieve the mandatory advising contact policy, including email and phone advising, or possible longer periods between advising contacts (e.g., annual mandatory advising for some students; this would require that course schedules be prepared on an annual, rather than semester, basis)
- Identification to the General Education Committee of issues that require clarification for departmentally-based advisors
- Better communication and coordination of advising between ASC/EOP and academic departments and increased involvement of faculty with freshman and pre-major advising, especially in support of earlier identification of appropriate honors options, national and international scholarship competitions, and bachelor’s-masters or other accelerated degree options. Exploration of earlier admission to the major, other alternatives to increase student-faculty interaction in the development of the student’s academic plan, and alternatives to the “advisement center” model for freshman and pre-major advising
• In support of improvement of academic advising, development of opportunities for departments to learn from one another and from external sources about various models of advising including the benefits, disadvantages, and costs of these models.
• Development of departmentally-based “Orientation/welcome” programs for new majors
• Methods to address the particular “transition” needs and ongoing issues of transfer students
• Revision of the Undergraduate Bulletin to improve its usefulness as an advising tool
• Preparation and continued enhancement of an advising guide for students and a guide for advisors, and workshops and other means for advisors to learn more information, techniques, and strategies for effective advising
• Options to provide easier access to courses – especially of General Education courses -- including the widespread use of “permission numbers” that generates student frustration and runaround
• Examination of institutional processes to eliminate student runaround, including approvals for waivers, substitutions, etc.; improved communication protocols among major and minor departments and administrative and academic departments
Appendix 9.4 Requirements of the General Education Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary Perspectives:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>(min. 3 crs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>(min. 3 crs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Sciences</strong></td>
<td><em>(min. 6 crs)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Sciences</strong></td>
<td><em>(min. 6 crs)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural and Historical Perspectives:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Historical Perspectives</td>
<td>(min. 3 crs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>(min. 3 crs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regions beyond Europe</td>
<td>(min. 3 crs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global and Cross-Cultural Studies</strong></td>
<td><em>(min. 3 crs)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Diversity &amp; Pluralism</strong></td>
<td><em>(min. 3 crs)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication and Reasoning Competencies:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>(min. 1 course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Discourse</td>
<td>(min. 1 course)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Discourse:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower level Writing</td>
<td>(min. 1 course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper level Writing</strong></td>
<td><em>(min. 1 course)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mathematics and Statistics:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one semester of collegiate study, or the equivalent of mathematics at or above the level of pre-calculus and/or probability, statistics, and data analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foreign Language:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>two semesters of collegiate study, or the equivalent, of a foreign language</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Italics indicates requirement that is greater than SUNY System

These requirements are listed at the University’s General Education Web page:
http://www.albany.edu/gened/requirements.shtml
Also available in the electronic version of the Undergraduate Bulletin at:
http://www.albany.edu/undergraduate_bulletin/general_education.html
And also available in the printed bulletin (page 52, 2008-2009)
Appendix 9.5: Major Academic Plans (MAPs) for Philosophy and Biology

http://www.albany.edu/advisement/MAPs/PHI.pdf
http://www.albany.edu/advisement/MAPs/Biology_BS_09.pdf

Appendix 9.6: University at Albany General Education Learning Objectives

Learning Objectives for General Education Arts Courses
Courses in the General Education category of Arts enable students to demonstrate:
1. an understanding of the history and/or practice of one form of artistic expression
2. recognition of the difference and overlap between creative and critical thinking
3. an understanding of the function and meaning of form
4. that they have the vocabulary they need to continue to learn about how art is made and interpreted
5. depending on the nature of the course, arts courses enable students to demonstrate an understanding of how art works are embedded within different cultures at different times and places

Learning Objectives for General Education Humanities Courses
Courses in the General Education category of Humanities enable students to demonstrate:
1. knowledge of the assumptions, methods of study, and theories of at least one of the disciplines within the humanities
Depending on the discipline, courses in the General Education category of Humanities enable students to demonstrate some or all of the following:
1. an understanding of the objects of study as expressions of the cultural contexts of the people who created them
2. an understanding of the continuing relevance of the objects of study to the present and to the world outside the University
3. an ability to employ the terms and understand the conventions particular to the discipline
4. an ability to analyze and assess the strengths and weaknesses of ideas and positions along with the reasons or arguments that can be given for and against them
5. an understanding of the nature of the texts, artifacts, ideas, or discourse of the discipline and of the assumptions that underlie this understanding, including those relating to issues of tradition and canon

Learning Objectives for General Education Natural Science Courses
Courses in the General Education category of Natural Science enable students to demonstrate:
1. an understanding of the methods scientists use to explore natural phenomena, including observation, hypothesis development, measurement and data collection, experimentation, evaluation of evidence
2. an understanding of the application of scientific data, concepts, and models in the natural sciences
3. an understanding of the major principles and concepts that form the basis of the knowledge covered in the course and a command of the relevant terminology appropriate for basic discourse in the particular discipline or disciplines of the course
4. that they have become more knowledgeable consumers of scientific information and are prepared to make informed decisions on contemporary issues involving scientific information acquired in the course

Learning Objectives for General Education Social Science Courses
Courses in the General Education category of Social Science enable students to demonstrate:
1. an understanding that human conduct and behavior more generally are subject to scientific inquiry
2. an understanding of the difference between rigorous and systematic thinking and uncritical thinking about social phenomena
3. an understanding of the kinds of questions social scientists ask and the ways they go about answering these questions
4. knowledge of the major concepts, models and issues of at least one discipline in the social sciences
5. an understanding of the methods social scientists use to explore social phenomena, such as observation, hypothesis development, measurement and data collection, experimentation, evaluation of evidence, employment of mathematical analysis, employment of interpretive analysis

Learning Objectives for U.S. History
Courses in the General Education category of U.S. History enable students to demonstrate:
1. knowledge of a basic narrative of American history (political, economic, social, and/or cultural), including an awareness of unity and diversity in American society
2. knowledge of representative institutions in American society and how they have shaped and been shaped by different groups
3. an understanding of the relationship(s) between America and other parts of the world
4. an understanding of various tools and approaches used in interpreting U.S. history

Learning Objectives for General Education Europe Courses
Courses in the General Education category of Europe enable students to demonstrate:
1. an understanding of the variety of cultures, regions, and countries that make up Europe
2. knowledge of the distinctiveness of Europe as manifested in the development of diverse histories, institutions, economies, societies, and cultures
3. knowledge of the relationship between Europe and other regions of the world as expressed through political, economic, and cultural contact
4. an awareness of how Europe has been used as a cultural standard against which other cultures are measured
5. an understanding of how the knowledge that becomes the basis of historical inquiry is constructed

Learning Objectives for General Education Regions Beyond Europe Courses
Courses in the General Education category of Regions Beyond Europe enable students to demonstrate:
1. knowledge of the distinctive features (e.g. history, institutions, economies, societies, cultures) of one region beyond Europe or European North America
2. an understanding of the region from the perspective of its people(s)
3. an ability to analyze and contextualize cultural and historical materials relevant to the region
4. an ability to locate and identify distinctive geographical features of the region

**Learning Objectives for General Education Global and Cross-Cultural Studies Courses**
Courses in the General Education category of Global and Cross-Cultural Studies enable students to demonstrate:
1. an understanding of the impact (e.g. economic, political, historical, cultural) of nations, regions, and cultures upon other nations, regions, and cultures
2. an understanding of the reciprocal interactions between individuals and global systems
3. an ability to see cultural groups from their own points of view
4. an ability to use the analytic tools of a specific discipline to engage in comparative analyses of cultures, nations, and regions

**Learning Objectives for U.S. Diversity and Pluralism**
Courses in the General Education category of U.S. Pluralism and Diversity enable students to demonstrate:
1. knowledge and understanding of the diversity and pluralism of U.S. society with respect to race, ethnicity, and gender, as well as class, sexual orientation, and/or religion.
2. knowledge and understanding of the social and cultural influences that shape the perspectives of various social groups as well as students' own points of view.
3. knowledge and understanding of the contributions of various social groups to U.S. society.
4. knowledge and understanding of the sources and manifestations of controversy or conflict arising from U.S. diversity and pluralism.

**Learning Objectives for General Education Information Literacy Courses**
Courses in the General Education category of Information Literacy enable students to:
1. locate, evaluate, synthesize and use information from a variety of sources understand and use basic research techniques appropriate to the course discipline
2. understand the various ways in which information is organized and structured
3. understand the ethical issues involved in accessing and using information

**Learning Objectives for Mathematics and Statistics**
Courses in the General Education category of Mathematics and Statistics enable students to demonstrate:
1. knowledge of concepts, terms, and symbols used to analyze data
2. an ability to formulate problems in abstract form amenable to mathematical, statistical, or logical analysis
3. an ability to perform appropriate operations to draw conclusions from data
   an ability to interpret and communicate quantitative information

**Learning Objectives for Foreign Language**
Courses in the General Education category of Foreign Language enable students to demonstrate:
1. proficiency in the understanding and use of fundamental elements of a foreign language
2. knowledge of distinctive features of the culture(s) associated with the language they are studying
### Appendix 9.6: General Education Seats Generated by Different Types of Instructors, Across Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Spring 2008</th>
<th>Spring 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured or Tenure</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track FT</td>
<td>13,391</td>
<td>12,361</td>
<td>13,557</td>
<td>11,360</td>
<td>13,302</td>
<td>11,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Adjuncts</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11,329</td>
<td>11,486</td>
<td>13,018</td>
<td>11,810</td>
<td>13,851</td>
<td>13,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>2,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenure Track FT</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>2,401</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>2,079</td>
<td>3,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>2,013</td>
<td>2,436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9.7 - Aggregated DARS audit information showing the number of students with unmet General Education requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prebearn</th>
<th>Soponeen</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>2731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global and Cross-Cultural Studies</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>2857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>2070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Statistics</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Discourse</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>2401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Beyond Europe</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Diversity &amp; Globalism</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. History</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>3071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Discourse</td>
<td>1791</td>
<td>2639</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>5230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prebearn</th>
<th>Soponeen</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>2351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global and Cross-Cultural Studies</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>2496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>1811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics and Statistics</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Discourse</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Beyond Europe</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>2853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Diversity &amp; Globalism</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. History</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>2691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Discourse</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 9.8 Fall General Education Seats offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen Ed Category</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH-EUR</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>2,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH-GLOBAL</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH-REG</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>2,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH-USDIV</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH-USHIS</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH-USHIS2</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>1,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP-ARTS</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP-HUM</td>
<td>3,836</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>4,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP-NATSCI</td>
<td>5,102</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP-SOCSCI</td>
<td>7,680</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>7,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANG</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>3,176</td>
<td>3,062</td>
<td>34,823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Level</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Discourse</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>1,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Literacy</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Intensive</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>3,202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9.9 - Example of how the General Education registration data are used, combining knowledge of student majors and the expected size of the new freshman and transfer populations to project demand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Course Offerings</th>
<th>Student Course Needs Estimates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Cap Enrl</td>
<td>From MAPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extrapolating from DARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FROM DARS DATA (applying formula to meet need of 25% soph; 50% jrs. 75% srs. 100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference from offerings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curs Atr Val</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH-EUR</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH-GLOBAL</td>
<td>1745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH-REG</td>
<td>2056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH-USDIV</td>
<td>2298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH-USHIS</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH-USHIS2</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP-ARTS</td>
<td>2271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP-HUM</td>
<td>3836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP-NATSCI</td>
<td>5102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP-SOCSCI</td>
<td>7680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANG</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>3568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>31761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Discourse</td>
<td>1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Literacy</td>
<td>1634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Intensive</td>
<td>1499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other MAP needs

| FL1                      | 33                             |
| Blaw 220                 | 970                            | 629 |
| Phy 145                  | 162                            | 89 |
| Chem 124                 | 520                            | 436 |
| Phy 106                  | 252                            | 17 |
| Csi 101                  | 300                            | 66 |
| Csi 201                  | 250                            | 23 |
| Doc 251                  | 18                             | 4  |
| Eng 200+                 | 955                            | 83 |
| Glo concentration course | 5                              |
| Hist 100-200             | 1041                           | 66 |
| JD 100                   | 120                            | 54 |
| Mus 165/186/187/287/289  | 332                            | 16 |
| Thr 135/235/240          | 120                            | 10 |
| Bio 120                  | 560                            | 341 (392 allocated per dept plan) |
| Electives                | 962                            |

### oral discourse

8813

### info literacy

### writing intensive

23833
Appendix 9.10: Courses submitted to SUNY for General Education Approval, 2008-2009

The Arts
AFRE338, French Cinema and Society
AJST458/ATHR458, Jewish Drama and Theatre
ARUS280, Soviet and Russian Cinema

Humanities
AFRE338, French Cinema and Society
ARUS352/ARUS352Z, Vladimir Vladimirovich Nabokov
TPHI238, Introduction to Bioethics

Social Sciences
NENG/NSCI 102, Societal Impacts of Nanotechnology
NENG/NSCI 103, Economic Impacts of Nanotechnology
NENG/NSCI 104, Disruptive Nanotechnologies
TANT141, Human Rights and Wrongs: Anthropological Explorations
TPOS248, Identities, Boundaries, and Mobilization
TSOC274Z, U.S. Foreign Policy in Comparative Perspective
TSSW295, Community Change in a Globalizing World

Natural Sciences
AATM/AENV 200, Natural Disasters
AGEO110, The Search for Life Beyond Earth
HSPH105H, Demystifying Public Health
HSPH231, Concepts in Epidemiology
NENG/NSCI 101, Nanotechnology Survey
NENG/NSCI 110, Chemical Principles of Nanoscale Science and Engineering I
NENG 112, Chemical Principles of Nanoscale Science and Engineering II
NENG/NSCI 120, Physical Principles of Nanoscale Science and Engineering I
NENG/NSCI 122, Physical Principles of Nanoscale Science and Engineering II
TENG/TSCI 124, Physical Principles of Nanoscale Science and Engineering III

Regions Beyond Europe
AANT104, Introduction to Archaeology
AEAC374/AHIS374, Crime and Punishment in Traditional China
AGOG266/AGLO266, India: Development Debates
AJST373, The Arab in Israeli Literature
ARUS280, Soviet and Russian Cinema
RPOS348, Politics of Southeast Asia
TGOG266/TGLO266, India: Development Debates
TPOS348, Politics of Southeast Asia

Europe
AHIS298, Crime and Society in Early Modern England
AITA350, Contemporary Italian Society
ARUS162/ARUS162Z, Russia Today
ARUS352/ARUS352Z, Vladimir Vladimirovich Nabokov
THIS298, Crime and Society in Early Modern England

American History
AHIS276, Technology and Society in America
AHIS277, Culture and History of Food in the United States
AHIS331/AHIS331Z, Capitalism in America
AHIS332/AHIS332Z, Introduction to Public History in the United States
AJRL230/TJRL230Z, The Mass Media and War in U.S. History
THIS277, Culture and History of Food in the United States

Math
AMAT100, Pre-calculus
AMAT104, Topics in Modern Mathematics
Chapter 10: Related Educational Activities

Overview

The University at Albany offers a rich array of activities to supplement its traditional educational offerings. These range from informal, voluntary activities — including informational seminars, skill-building workshops, colloquia and cultural events — to formalized programs for student populations needing additional assistance to attain academic goals. While a wide variety of related educational activities are available, all share a common theme: they are designed to help students realize their full potential by building skills, providing enrichment, and preparing for professional success. Because the University is the academic home for such a diverse student population, it is appropriate that the institution provide multiple opportunities to promote academic achievement and personal growth.

Given the broad array of related educational activities available to students, this analysis confines itself to those formal programs and services that engage students for an extended period of time. For the purposes of the self-study, related educational activities have been defined as monitored offerings that: include a formal registration process; an extended period of engagement between a student and qualified faculty, professional staff and/or field representative; and should culminate in an assessment that the student has achieved a measurable threshold of competence. The following four types of related educational activities were examined for the self-study under this standard: Basic Skills, Experiential Learning, Non-credit Instructional/Contract Activities, Other Instructional Sites.

It should be noted that many academic departments include internships, placements and other activities that provide students with experience outside the classroom. Since in all of these cases such activities are linked to specific curricula, it was decided they should be discussed in Chapter 9, Educational Offerings and General Education.

All related educational activities as defined by the University fall into one of two categories: those where the institution identifies and selects populations that must participate in a given activity and those where students choose voluntarily. The Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) and the Intensive English Language Program (IELP) are good examples of programs that select mandatory participants. Both target students who are academically underprepared as evidenced by a variety of assessment criteria, including, but not limited to, their performance on standardized entrance exams. Students receive the attention and direction they need to build the necessary skills to achieve academic success; continued enrollment is contingent on performance and measurable progress.

Voluntary related educational activities are available to students as a recommended supplement to an academic program or on the basis of personal interest. Many of these activities provide students and faculty with an opportunity to develop a co-creative design beyond the traditional bricks and mortar collegiate setting. Programs such as Study Abroad and the University-wide internship programs offer the unique experience of immersing oneself in another culture or professional setting; the Community and Public Service Program fosters outreach to the community by engaging students with local agencies and organizations; the Professional Development Program and the Center for Public Health Continuing Education offer community professionals with life-long learning opportunities. In short, many of these activities serve to bridge the gap between classroom learning and community and professional realities.
This chapter addresses the fundamental charge questions through the evaluation of programs addressed by the definition above, and is organized by type of program. Within each section, specific programs addressing the category are reviewed. It should be noted that previous self-studies have not included a comparable section on Related Educational Activities. A decade ago, UAlbany’s self-study report had a short section entitled “Extended Learning,” which summarized the technology-enhanced courses the University offered at that time. Because this chapter clusters a set of programs and services together for the first time, it is difficult to provide a comparative review of how these activities have evolved over the past decade. The University may wish to consider using this standard in future self-studies in order to maintain consistency and appropriate points of comparison.

Basic Skill Programs

The University at Albany’s Office of Academic Support Services (OASS) has been nationally recognized and awarded for its outstanding programs. The office provides a variety of academic support services that assist students seeking to improve and maintain their academic excellence. Several of the programs were briefly described in Chapter 7, Student Support Services. Considered here are EOP, the Collegiate Science and Technology Entry Program (CSTEP), and the Science and Technology Entry Program (STEP).

Educational Opportunity Program (EOP)

EOP is a state-funded program that supports economically and educationally disadvantaged New York State residents of all races. Each year, it accepts approximately 145 freshman and 40 transfer students; it supports nearly 700 students who remain connected to EOP for their entire undergraduate careers. The program provides services designed to help students achieve success by providing support in academic, financial, social and personal matters. Academic support is offered in several forms: developmental coursework in math; reading and writing; tutors; study groups and study materials; and on-site counselors who offer both one-to-one counseling and graduate school advisement. Counselors are trained in graduate counseling psychology and/or social work. Admission to EOP is highly competitive, with far more applicants than the 140-150 students who are typically admitted (Appendix 10.1, for eligibility requirements).

Once accepted, all EOP freshmen participate in a mandatory five-week Pre-College Residential Summer Program designed to acclimate them to UAlbany life and academic study. This includes participation in mandatory study sessions and workshops, and adherence to curfew. EOP transfer students attend a one-day orientation and are then monitored through the EOP “Transfer Outreach Program.” All EOP students are expected to remain actively engaged in the program throughout their University studies. In addition to completing the requirements for their chosen academic discipline, students are expected to engage with their EOP counselors, participate in study groups, and be active members of the campus community. Over 15% of EOP degree recipients graduate with honors.

EOP places a strong emphasis on diversity, respect, and a sense of belonging; this results in a holistic approach to student engagement. This model has been highly successful in encouraging students to take responsibility for their own learning. The values that have been integrated by EOP may be used to inform the broader campus community on how to further engage students as active learners in their undergraduate academic experience. Further, EOP encourages an atmosphere of motivation and encouragement. The University may wish to explore whether this
model might inform other aspects of the curriculum to develop a more holistic student experience across the University.

At completion of the five-week summer program, EOP surveys students on the program’s effectiveness, including suggestions where enhancements could be made. Areas assessed include an academic component (too easy, difficult, just right), faculty and staff competence, administration competence, organization of program, EOP counseling staff assistance (helpful to non-helpful), student employee competence, University facilities, programmatic trips/outings, and social events. Overwhelmingly, of the usual 145-170 students enrolled in the program, 97% report general program satisfaction in the “Excellent/Well Organized/Wouldn’t change a thing” categories. The remaining 3% focus on better living conditions (e.g., rooms too hot) and less restrictive rules (e.g., too many rules, don’t care for curfews or other rules enforced).

Beyond the initial Residential Summer Program, retention rates are initially quite high; in fact, EOP boasts the highest rate of first-year retention of all comparable cohorts and maintains strong numbers throughout the five years that funding is available to its students. This indicates that EOP is highly successful at engaging students early in their UAlbany careers and that the five-week program has been identified as a role model retention-producing program whose students excel academically and go on to be very visible student leaders and University citizens. EOP was recognized in 2000 by the Noel/Levitz assessment agency for its effectiveness in retention and academic excellence outcomes.¹

Given these statistics, one might expect EOP students to have similarly high graduation rates. Yet, according to statistics provided by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness, in 2003, 2004 and 2005, four-year EOP graduation rates were 45.3%, 47.6% and 50.6%, respectively — numbers slightly lower than some other cohort groups, including traditionally admitted students. The statistics suggest there may be barriers or impediments that affect EOP students as they progress through their studies. In light of the remarkable first-year retention rate, the University should consider asking the program to develop an assessment plan that would allow it to examine its retention and graduation rates and determine whether graduation rates can be increased.

The Collegiate Science and Technology Entry Program (CSTEP) and the Science and Technology Entry Program (STEP)

CSTEP and STEP are both funded by the New York State Education Department to increase the number of historically underrepresented and economically disadvantaged students in science, technology, engineering, mathematics (STEM), and health-related areas. Only New York residents are eligible for these programs.

CSTEP is designed to assist college students in becoming successful in these fields; the program pursues partnerships with departments within the University as well as with other community agencies in order to support the development of future STEM professionals. In addition, CSTEP provides students with opportunities to conduct summer research, receive peer mentor/tutor help, participate on educational field trips, present research at conferences, and receive discounts toward graduate preparatory courses. Retention rates reflect a highly successful program: 85% of CSTEP seniors graduate, with 40% taking graduate entrance examinations.

¹ [https://www.noellevitz.com/Papers+and+Research/Retention+Excellence+Awards/](https://www.noellevitz.com/Papers+and+Research/Retention+Excellence+Awards/)
STEP assists similarly underrepresented and economically disadvantaged middle and high school students in preparing to enter college in the STEM fields. Tutorial and programming services are centered on academic support and college attainment and are provided onsite at various school districts and, on Saturday mornings, at UAlbany. STEP also provides a three-week summer non-residential program, where students are engaged in programming/summer projects, and participate in weekly field trips relevant to the mission of the program. This program is similarly successful: 93% of high school seniors who participate in the STEP program graduate, with 62% receiving state Regent’s diplomas and 85% continuing on to college.

**Intensive English Language Program (IELP)**

IELP is designed to improve the speaking skills of those for whom English is a second language. It is intended for international students seeking admission to an American college or university by bridging the gap between academic success in their first language and attaining that success in a second language. The program delivers high-quality English language instruction, supports the University’s academic programs by facilitating conditional admission of academically qualified students who need English language support, and provides remedial English to admitted students. IELP fosters a strong foundation and allows students to make connections to other students, faculty and staff, providing for a more holistic University experience.

Participants are drawn from three distinct groups. The first and largest consists of students seeking full-time English language instruction who have not made definite decisions about their academic futures; these students self-identify and apply to IELP directly. The second population consists of conditional applicants to UAlbany. These individuals must complete one or more semesters in IELP until their end-of-semester exam scores are high enough to permit full-time study in the following semester. Potential students are identified by the Office of Undergraduate Admissions or academic departments contemplating admission of an international graduate student. The third and smallest group is comprised of UAlbany undergraduates and graduates taking individual remedial courses to enhance their English skills. Potential students may self-identify, but more often they are “advised” into these course options by faculty, advisors in the Advisement Services Center or EOP, or the Office of International Education.

Students typically enroll for 16-week courses in the fall or spring semester or an eight-week summer program. It is not uncommon for students to complete two semesters or even a full year of IELP study. Shorter programs are also available to current students who wish to continue improving their English-speaking skills. ESL 001 and/or ESL 002 are non-credit courses offered every fall and spring semester and are funded by the Research Foundation. UNI 100 and ENG 226 (which are credit-bearing) are offered once or twice a year through IFR resources from the Office of International Education. All IELP classes have an “English only” policy, and the program includes cultural activities and local field trips to help students acclimate to their new surroundings. Students are encouraged to become comfortable with speaking in class, asking questions, and other cultural aspects of American education, including the use of technology. There is considerable focus on conversational interaction, and the program is always looking for ways to provide new opportunities for students to converse with native English speakers.

Non-native students are assessed on their proficiency in English, either by completing the Intensive English Language Program (TOEFL) exam with a score of 79 or higher, or by receiving a 6.0 on the International English Language Testing System (IELTS). Students may apply for conditional admission to the University, leading to matriculation after completing the IELP program and achieving a passing score on the TOEFL exam. Students who receive passing
scores on these exams may choose to enroll in IELP voluntarily in order to improve their English skills.

Students are initially assessed to determine their current level of skill, and reassessed at periodic intervals to ensure they are making appropriate progress. An initial watch period ensures that a student has been assessed accurately. Evaluations are a key component of the program, and professional staff use standardized measures, as well as individual conferences with students, to discuss progress and future plans.

IELP has grown substantially over the past few years: enrollments have risen from 50-60 students to 100-110 students per semester. Continued moderate growth is possible, but will depend on space availability and the desirability of increasing international conditional admits. All IELP faculty and professional staff meet Research Foundation requirements for hiring. Instructors frequently participate in professional development activities by attending and/or presenting at local and national conferences. IELP holds in-house and professional development workshops on a regular basis.

The program director believes students who have successfully completed IELP are better prepared for academic studies and have a better experience adjusting to the University. Statistics tracking the long-term success of IELP students are not readily available, so defining and tracking performance, retention and graduation rates should be instituted, at least for those IELP students who continue their studies at the University. This information will capitalize on the strengths of the program and assist in recruitment; it may also assist in evaluating the required scores on entrance exams to ensure the program continues to meet high standards. It may be useful to evaluate the TOEFL and IELTS exams on a periodic basis. According to Graduate Admissions staff, the IELTS exam is becoming increasingly popular in European countries. If this trend continues, IELP may wish to reevaluate the admission criteria for students who are conditionally admitted or those who are encouraged by academic departments to improve their English speaking skills. At the graduate level, it would also be useful to know how well former IELP students perform on comprehensive exams, completing theses and dissertations, and teaching assignments. This would provide IELP with additional evidence of its success, as well as ensure continuity between the IELP program and students’ academic departments. It would also demonstrate successful comprehension for non-native speakers, an important part of their academic achievement.

**Recommendations**

The University should consider evaluating the EOP program to determine whether retention rates after three semesters can be increased. UAlbany should also develop a system to define and track performance, retention and graduation rates of IELP students, at least those IELP students who continue their studies at the University.

**Experiential Learning**

**University Internships - UNI 390, 391 and 392 (3-15 credits)**

The Office of Undergraduate Education at the University at Albany provides coordination of and advisement for student-initiated interdisciplinary majors and minors, and several interdisciplinary courses. It oversees and organizes student and faculty-initiated internships (UNI 390), as well as the campus application process for well-established internships with the New York State Senate (UNI 391) and Assembly (UNI 392).
As stated in its mission, the Office for Undergraduate Education seeks to provide all students with a wide variety of educational experiences. UNI 390, which can be taken for 3-15 credits per semester, provides students with an opportunity to acquire practical “hands-on” experience in a field or area that interests them. The New York State Senate and Assembly internships (15 credits per semester) engage students with state government and provide first-hand knowledge of the legislative process. Students who apply for UNI 392 can also apply for the Stanley Fink Legislative Internship, endowed by the Bell-Atlantic Foundation in the name of the former speaker of the State Assembly. Competitive and prestigious, this internship carries a stipend and 15 credits for one semester in the Assembly.

All internships approved through UNI 390 require the supervision of a qualified on-site supervisor and a full-time teaching faculty sponsor whose expertise applies to the work the student will engage in as an intern. The on-site supervisor evaluates the student’s performance and provides constructive feedback both to the student and faculty sponsor. UNI 391 and 392 are evaluated on a five-year cycle by the national Program on Non-Collegiate Sponsored Instruction for the purpose of reassessing its comparability to college-level instruction. Both the Assembly and Senate internships are supervised by a full-time teaching faculty member.

Internship credits count toward the 120 overall credits required to meet graduation. Most students prefer to acquire elective credits through an internship, where they can fulfill their elective requirements while getting valuable hands-on work experience. To obtain an internship, students must have already earned 56 credits (junior status) and have an overall grade point average of 2.5 or above.

There are many procedures in place to determine that UNI 390, 391 and 392 have sufficient academic rigor and are offered by qualified faculty or professional staff. The Interdisciplinary Studies Committee of the Undergraduate Academic Council has the primary responsibility for reviewing and approving UNI 390 internship applications. The committee’s willingness to approve an internship depends heavily on the information submitted by the on-site supervisor and the faculty sponsor. Students are required to submit a document from the host agency or organization on letterhead stationery, specifying in detail what the student’s responsibilities will be; they also must submit a supporting letter from their faculty sponsor (who must be a member of the full-time teaching staff). The letter from the faculty sponsor must clearly identify the nature of the academic component, including a description of required written work and reading assignments. UNI 391 and 392 also require the support of a full-time faculty sponsor. In addition, the New York State Assembly Internship program has two full time professors-in-residence who teach a course, “Politics and Policy in the New York State Legislative Process,” designed to explore how politics influences policy in New York’s legislative process. Both professors have a wealth of knowledge and experience in public policy and service. Additionally, all interns are assigned to work with an Assembly member.

The professional staff, faculty, and administration highly support UNI 390, 391 and 392. Most referrals come from academic departments, some of which allow up to six credits of UNI 391 and 392 to be counted towards a student’s major or minor.

University internships provide valuable experience beyond the traditional classroom, helping students to enhance and integrate what they have learned in their studies within a relevant professional setting. Students must be active learners, accepting responsibility for creating a meaningful program of study. In some cases, internships bridge academic work with a student’s intended profession. Further, these activities represent a coherent part of the student's academic program, not an isolated experience. An additional benefit is the ability to network and build
mentoring relationships with well-informed individuals in the field of placement who can assist the students in the job search process upon graduation.

It is not clear how students across disciplines are made aware of internship opportunities. The Advisement Services Center (see Chapter 7, Student Support Services), which provides academic advisement to students who have not yet declared a major, encourages internships through advisement, as well as lists them on Major Academic Pathways (MAPS), available on the Advisement Services Web page. According to the Office of Undergraduate Education, approximately 20 students register for UNI 390 each semester. Participation among communication, journalism and criminal justice students is quite common. The Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy, which has many links to state and local government, provides information on UNI 391 and 392 on its Website. Conversely, with UAlbany’s Undergraduate Bulletin having moved to an online format, students now may be less likely to learn about internship opportunities by happenstance, as they could while paging through a document. The University should evaluate the benefits of promoting these programs more broadly and assessing whether that would increase participation across disciplines.

There are organizations that provide UNI 390 internship opportunities to UAlbany students on a regular basis. Many of these have reputations for providing students with positive experiences, and this is useful for informing the approval process. The University does not have a process for tracking internships, and this may be worth consideration. While the Office of Undergraduate Education reports that students enjoy internship opportunities, it may be advisable to develop a protocol in the event someone has a less than enjoyable experience. Such a procedure may help faculty, students and the Interdisciplinary Studies Committee to make informed decisions about future internship opportunities.

Community and Public Service Program

For more than 35 years, the School of Social Welfare has administered the Community and Public Service Program (CPSP), which has become central to community engagement efforts at UAlbany. The CPSP courses (RSSW 290, 291, and 390) provide approximately 700 undergraduate students a year, in all academic disciplines, the opportunity to participate in community service opportunities in the Greater Capital Region while earning course credit. Born out of the highly turbulent student protests of the late 1960s, the first community service project was completed by University at Albany students in 1970 and since then CPSP has served as a nexus connecting the campus with the community. The focus of CPSP is on meeting the needs of community organizations by connecting them with faculty and students who can help them advance their mission and build their capacities. Students are provided with the opportunity to engage with public and non-profit organizations in exchange for elective credits. With 400 organizations from which to choose, CPSP offers a wide range of opportunities for faculty engagement and student volunteering.

Besides the obvious benefits for a diverse group of constituencies and organizations, community engagement offers a variety of rewards to students. This includes a sense of satisfaction, deepening levels of compassion and personal growth, as well as the nurturing of a lifelong commitment to civic engagement. Community engagement is a challenging endeavor that gives student-citizens the chance to reflect on salient issues in a democratic society, including diversity

---

2 http://www.albany.edu/advisement/Newsite/maps.html
3 http://www.albany.edu/cpsp/main/history.html
and discrimination and the roles of the non-profit and public sectors, as well as consideration of individual career goals.

The CPSP experience also helps students integrate classroom learning with their academic and career goals. CPSP staff members — one full-time faculty member, who also serves as the director; two Ph.D. students; and one MSW student from the School of Social Welfare — are available to help students select appropriate placements and communicate with field supervisors regarding their progress.

Although participation is purely on a volunteer basis, students are expected to complete assignments (i.e., an electronic media project and signed volunteer logs) as part of the coursework and satisfy terms of an individualized learning contract; this identifies their learning objectives and goals for the internship experience. At the conclusion of the internship, the CPSP students are expected to complete a reflective essay that relates to their learning contract. They also are required to complete a course evaluation. The collective data provide the director and the advisory board with information about the site and the students’ overall experiences in terms of program quality and renewal. CPSP supervisors are also expected to complete an evaluation of the students’ performance at the conclusion of their internship.

It is important to note that, beginning in fall 2008, a yearly quality assurance survey (Community Public Service Program Partner Survey) was instituted to gather information about program-related issues and concerns from CPSP community public service partners. In addition, all agencies are regularly evaluated by the student and the program to determine if the mission and goals are being met. For a complete list of current agency placements, visit http://www.albany.edu/cpsp/main/agencies/index.html.

The program’s Advisory Committee includes several representatives from local agencies and a variety of UAlbany departments. This group fosters ongoing dialogue and information-sharing between the University and local agency participants — which may be one of the contributing factors to this successful program.

Recommendations

- The University should evaluate the benefits of promoting internship programs more broadly, and assess whether this would increase participation across disciplines. It should also develop a protocol for tracking UNI 390 internships. Such a protocol may help faculty, students and the Interdisciplinary Studies Committee to make more informed decisions about internship opportunities.

Non-Credit Instructional Activities

Professional Development Program, Rockefeller College

One of the largest university-based continuing professional education programs in the nation, the Professional Development Program (PDP) originated in 1975 through a small planning contract with the former New York State Department of Social Services to provide a comprehensive training plan for both local and state workers in the social services field. From that modest beginning, PDP has established an international reputation for delivering quality learning.
products on time and on budget, a track record that has resulted in cumulative funding in excess of $350 million. In 2008, PDP accounted for more than 20% of the University’s sponsor-funded programs.

During the past year, over 25,000 participants have been served through the offering of PDP’s approximately 3,500 instructional activities. In fulfilling its mission of offering related educational activities, PDP annually presents a range of non-credit bearing programs, including but not limited to non-credit courses, continuing professional education activities, forums, conferences and seminars, speaker and visiting lecturer series, panel discussions, technology skills-training, and other faculty, staff and student development activities.

PDP is a respected and sought-out partner. Its more than 250 highly skilled employees provide technical assistance/consultation, curricula design and development, instructional design, needs assessment, train-the-trainer programs, e-learning solutions, Web design/development, graphic design, conference planning and management, and project management. PDP also has long been committed to the concept of the university of the future — a teaching and research institution that is responsive to the public service sector. Since it first started offering training courses in 1976, PDP has been a major contributor to the realization of the service mission of the University. PDP’s own core mission is to “make a difference in a changing world by linking the learning, applied research and evaluation resources of the University with the continuing professional education needs of the public service.” PDP’s strategic location within UAlbany’s Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy, coupled with its highly regarded continuing professional education programs, make the connection between policy and practice a reality. PDP serves as an important bridge between the academy and the public sector, and, for nearly 35 years, has been a strong supporter of the University’s efforts to promote and support community engagement.

PDP works closely with program sponsors, key stakeholders and representatives from target populations to identify training needs and ensure that in developing a broad range of course offerings it provides the knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to support trainees in performing their jobs efficiently and effectively. As appropriate, PDP engages University faculty in the review of program curricula or utilizes University faculty and staff to develop and deliver course offerings.

The related educational activities offered by PDP fall well within the guidelines of the various policies and procedures governing sponsored programs at UAlbany; these are contracted through the Research Foundation of SUNY. Guidelines are clearly outlined on the University and Research Foundation Websites. Additionally, program sponsors provide project operations manuals and other similar resources detailing their requirements.

As most of PDP’s current project sponsors are New York State agencies, developing synergy between PDP and schools/departments of the University is essential. Through this synergy, PDP has brought policy and practice together to provide programs that speak directly to the needs of the public sector. Through PDP’s Public Service Workshops Program, funded by the Governor’s Office of Employee Relations, faculty of Rockefeller College, the School of Social Welfare, the School of Public Health, the Center for Women in Government and Civil Society, the Center for Technology in Government, and the Department of Geography and Planning, instruct New York State employees in job titles that are included in the professional, scientific and technical bargaining unit. This interaction with New York State policymakers and professionals is brought back to the classroom by faculty and used to enrich comparable educational offerings for undergraduate and graduate students.
Graduate and undergraduate students are provided with the opportunity to explore internships in various disciplines; PDP, as a center within Rockefeller College, has worked through it to identify individual students with expertise and interest in PDP’s internship opportunities. Over the years, numerous students have benefited from being placed either at PDP in internships or in many of the state agencies with which PDP works. Additionally, PDP conducts intern forums to solicit feedback from interns about their placements. This information is used to improve upon the student intern experience for future placements. PDP’s internship program has had a track record of success. Many former interns credit their PDP internship experience as a primary reason for their going on to successful professional careers in public service.

Qualified faculty and professional staff assigned to deliver PDP’s program offerings are fully vetted to assure that pedagogical standards are met. PDP works closely with deans, assistant deans, and department chairs to assess the qualifications of faculty or professional staff who could offer related educational activities. PDP follows established Research Foundation of SUNY guidelines for hiring practices and evaluates all of its related educational activities using a workshop evaluation instrument that typically contains several questions related to faculty performance and expertise. Furthermore, PDP employs highly qualified staff in professional, technical, and administrative support positions who are organized to produce and deliver a wide range of innovative continuing professional education programs across diverse content areas. PDP offers state of the art online learning solutions to its project sponsors. Professional staff are supported by a team of educational multimedia technicians, network technical support staff and programmers.

Evaluating student learning outcomes is a critical component of PDP’s overall program evaluation. PDP regularly measures participant reaction and learning-gain via participant questionnaires, pre-training and post-training tests or post tests only. All programs must perform at a consistently acceptable level. The results of each individual educational activity and each series of the same educational activities are carefully analyzed by PDP program evaluation staff and PDP management. Evaluation data are used to provide a basis for program enhancements.

As a highly respected provider of continuing professional education opportunities aimed primarily at serving the workforce development needs of the public sector, PDP has been a consistent leader in advancing high quality, well-vetted, and relevant related educational activities that address both the community engagement and service missions of the University. Moving forward, PDP plans to continue to support the University’s commitment to advancing related educational activities for this non-traditional population.

**Center for Public Health Continuing Education, School of Public Health**

The Center for Public Health Continuing Education (CPHCE) at the School of Public Health (SPH) provides programs that support a well-prepared public workforce. It has a primary mission providing exemplary education and training for the public workforce in the field of public health, both locally and globally (Appendix 10.2, for a list of programs offered).

Overall, the CPHCE programs impart a wide range of professional development and continuing professional education knowledge, technical assistance and service supporting the field of public health. These activities reinforce the primary goal of SPH: to “provide quality education, research, service, and leadership to improve public health and eliminate health disparities.” CPHCE programs and activities, which are associated with SPH, are an integral part of the expectations of the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH), which accredits schools of public health. One of the CEPH criteria for accreditation is: “Workforce Development: The
school shall engage in activities that support the professional development of the public health workforce.”

The CPHCE has advisory committees for many of its programs; these help determine the appropriateness of related educational activities for the Center’s varied student/worker population. All courses require evaluations with a feedback loop from participants to help shape future programs. CPHCE also has a Continuing Education Committee which is part of the school’s governance structure; it reviews course descriptions before programs are offered and also conducts post-program evaluations to assure that quality standards are met.

CPHCE’s continuing education activities are primarily offered for working professionals in the field of public health. However, programs, such as its satellite broadcasts, are publicized by the SPH and made available, at no cost, for all students. Online offerings such as past broadcasts and online courses are also available to students at no additional cost. Furthermore, to augment courses for the traditional students at the SPH, some faculty members integrate the content of various broadcasts or distance learning programs into the curriculum of their courses. This allows students to have exposure to topics and experts they might not otherwise experience.

The CPHCE remains committed to its primary goal of supporting working professionals. Through its various policies and procedures, it has implemented a fine-tuned system of checks and balances that are in place to maintain quality standards. This ensures that program offerings are of the highest quality and supported by a rich mix of SPH faculty and experts in the field.

Other Non-Credit Offerings

The University at Albany has several non-credit activities offered by various departments and offices. These activities, as defined by SUNY system administration, include “formally organized and scheduled non-credit activities which are instructional in nature and which require participant registration.” These offerings include vocational and technical training, remedial instruction, business and industry training, and other activities; these may include self-improvement and community service components, along with other opportunities. All activities represent learning areas with an instructional purpose and require formal participant registration.

Each year, the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness surveys campus units that offer non-credit instructional activity to gauge the level of activity, and reports the activity to SUNY system administration. Appendix 10.3 depicts the survey definitions and activity levels in 2007-08.

Recommendations

- As has been noted in some of the other related educational activities discussed in this chapter, it is not clear how individuals learn and avail themselves of such opportunities. It is not clear what statistics on these offerings should be gathered. The total number of registrations does not provide the University with a great deal of information about who its registrants are or how well activities meet their needs. The University should determine what statistics on non-credit offerings should be gathered, and whether the manner of assessment for these offerings provides a sense of their scope.

Other Instructional Sites

Study Abroad

The University’s branding initiative, “The World Within Reach,” is more than a figure of speech when it comes to the Study Abroad Program. Throughout the SUNY system, students can
participate in over 300 programs in more than 50 different countries (Appendix 10.4); UAlbany, through its Office of International Education (OIE), sponsors more than 65 programs in 35 countries. “Study Abroad” is defined as an activity that takes place outside of the United States for which the institution awards academic credit. The program provides students an opportunity to expand their core curriculum by offering courses, field experiences and living arrangements in an international setting. Students can take courses in English or another language and enroll in courses with native students while immersing themselves in another culture. This literally contributes to the University’s goal of bringing the world within reach by building global awareness and competence in UAlbany students. Activities such as international volunteering or participation in athletic events or music performances outside of the country are not considered part of a Study Abroad experience.

The Study Abroad and Exchanges Office within the OIE has clearly defined policies and procedures that govern the program, as well as policies and procedures to assess the scope and rigor of overseas offerings. All programs are mandated and regulated by SUNY system administration and overseen by the SUNY Council on International Education. Partnerships with other colleges and universities are evaluated and approved by SUNY system administration. All courses and curricula developed at UAlbany are subject to an institutional approval process, as well as approval by SUNY system administration.

Although participating institutions have different entrance requirements, all students must be in good academic standing to be eligible to study abroad. When Study Abroad assesses applications, it evaluates a student’s life experience in addition to academic performance. Recommendations and interviews play an important role in the decision-making process. Grades received for courses taken overseas are not figured into a student’s cumulative GPA. Grades received from any SUNY program will be listed on an official transcript supplement that is part of a student’s permanent record. With departmental approval, courses can count in a student’s major or minor, or may be approved to meet General Education requirements.

Study Abroad gains its primary support from promoting its opportunities to students and faculty. While this level of “bottom-up” self-promotion has led to successful collaborations between Study Abroad and faculty in developing new programs and opportunities overseas for students, the Study Abroad and Exchanges Office feels there may be room for more “top-down” collaboration. Increased promotion from academic department chairs may help eliminate any existing barriers in their departmental programs which currently make it difficult for students to participate in studying abroad. Further, academic departments could facilitate students’ participation in the overseas experience by examining their programs for domestic and study abroad tracks.

There is some concern within the Study Abroad office that students may see studying abroad as inconvenient, or even disruptive, to academic or extra-curricular activities and goals. Involvement in athletics, honors programs, and fraternities and sororities may be viewed as obstacles to spending a semester overseas. As with University internships, it is not clear how students across disciplines typically encounter information about the program. Study abroad opportunities are encouraged by the Advisement Services Center and are listed on Major Academic Pathways (MAPS), noted earlier. The degree to which these possibilities are discussed in academic departments is not known.

Some disciplines lend themselves to studying in another country (e.g., foreign languages, arts, and some humanities disciplines); others may not have such an obvious academic benefit. Yet it is arguable that there are advantages to broadening one’s horizons. In an increasingly
“flattening” world, the University should consider the overall importance of an immersion experience. Would studying abroad benefit our students, either by imprinting them with a broader sense of culture and self-awareness, or make them more attractive job candidates in an increasingly global economy? An institutional emphasis on the importance of diversity, living and learning with another culture, and the benefits of increased independence may bring the world within reach to more University at Albany students.

University in the High School

The University in the High School Program (UHS), under the direction and sponsorship of the College of Arts and Sciences, is a partnership program between the University and participating secondary schools throughout New York State. The program allows qualified students to earn college credit while still in high school. These credits can be used to fulfill degree requirements, as long as students successfully complete courses which are applicable to the curricular requirements of the degree. Additionally, UHS courses appear on a UAlbany transcript and can be considered for transfer credit at other institutions (Appendix 10.5, for a listing of courses and UHS staff).

By entering college with previously earned credits, students can hasten their graduation from college or explore a wider range of academic areas during a regular college sequence. The UHS program has a staff of six University employees who support teachers, high school administrators, students and parents throughout the entire process. Faculty liaisons from each academic department offer assistance to the high school teachers in the program (Appendix 10.5).

All UHS teachers must meet degree requirements and have teaching experience sufficient to qualify them as voluntary adjunct faculty. Teachers meeting the requirements for employment within respective academic departments are subsequently appointed as voluntary adjunct faculty of the University. Additionally, UHS teachers are evaluated by the appropriate UHS liaison. As has been customary in the past, UHS liaisons visit high school classrooms to monitor the academic standards set forth by the University and the respective academic departments. Faculty liaisons make visits to new high school classes and teachers in the first year and to existing classes and teachers at least every three years. The liaisons contact teachers prior to their intended visit in order to arrange a mutually agreeable day and time.

As the University in the High School Program at UAlbany has grown, so has the need to ensure the quality and integrity of the credit offered in each UHS participating school. UHS provides annual workshops on campus for high school teachers, principals, and school counselors to foster the development of professional relationships between department liaisons and teachers in each of the respective disciplines. Participation in the University in the High School Program’s annual workshops is an integral part of the UHS experience. Teachers are asked to come together and share creative ways to enhance their classroom experience. Attendance at UHS workshops is not mandatory, but is highly recommended.

The procedures for the creation of new UHS courses adhere to strict SUNY Service Area protocols. Once new course offerings have been decided upon, course guidelines (designed by the respective departments at the University), sample syllabi, General Education Learning Objectives and Outcomes, and a variety of course materials used on campus for each specific course will be sent to the high school. A course proposal sheet and syllabus guidelines detailing the materials required for a new course proposal are also sent. Once completed, new course proposal materials are sent to the UHS office for further processing. After initial review by the UHS office, the proposal is then forwarded to the appropriate departmental liaison on
campus, who either evaluates the submitted documentation individually or gathers comments from others in the department. It is then determined whether or not the proposed curriculum meets University at Albany standards for the same course as taught on campus.

A determination is also made regarding the qualifications of the high school teacher who will teach the particular University-level course. A site visit may be performed prior to approval. If and when the curriculum is approved and the teacher is deemed academically qualified to teach the course for University credit, the proposal is then forwarded to the dean of Arts and Sciences for review. If and when approval from the dean of Arts and Sciences is obtained, the proposal is then sent to the provost and vice president for Academic Affairs for final administrative approval. If final approval is received, the UHS office will notify the high school in writing of the proposal’s acceptance and the process for registering students. Generally, the entire approval process takes between two to six months, depending on the time of year and the quality and complexity of the submitted proposal. Proposals submitted in the spring may not be reviewed until the fall, as some University liaisons/faculty are on recess over the summer.

While high schools may inform students and their parents that they have submitted a course proposal to the UHS program, approval must be received in writing from the UHS office before a course is considered available for student registration. Retroactive enrollments are not permitted.

It should be noted that individual departments on campus can and do set their own standards for approval of course content. Departments also make assessments based on internal departmental requirements in regard to the academic qualifications necessary to teach University-level courses in their respective academic disciplines. Acceptance into the UHS Program is subject to approval based on academic standards established by the individual departments. UHS faculty liaisons monitor these standards by making periodic classroom visits; they can request changes/adjustments to the curriculum/teacher at any time deemed necessary.8

Students registered for UHS Program courses are encouraged to participate and familiarize themselves with the University setting by utilizing the University ID cards that the program provides them. These ID cards allow students on-site use of University library resources, campus recreational facilities, and student admission to sporting, cultural, and other University-sponsored events.9 This information, based on 2008-09 policy, is subject to change.

UHS receives high marks for its checks, balances and protocols to ensure high standards and ongoing evaluation. One recommendation is to promote the program’s rigorous standards and use them as a model for other programs seeking to ensure quality controls.

Conclusion

The University’s wide array of related educational activities provides rich accents to the University’s overall academic offerings. Regardless of whether such opportunities support scholarly endeavors, allow students to engage in experiential learning or bridge the gap between theory and practice, it is clear these programs are an important part of helping students and other members of the larger UAlbany community attain an education with meaningful context for life beyond the classroom.

---

8 http://www.albany.edu/uhsp/Pages/Teachers_Schools/Approval_Process.html
9 http://www.albany.edu/uhsp/index.html
It is fitting that the University offers a wealth of opportunities that promote exploration, creativity, critical thinking and discovery. Indeed, such activities encouraging matriculated students to build skills, self-reliance, social responsibility and meaningful professional and mentoring relationships, are often the hallmark of a mature, active learner. In the same way that UAlbany graduates must eventually learn to balance their professional and personal lives when they enter the workforce, many extended UAlbany educational activities help matriculated students balance experiential opportunities with traditional ones while they are engaged with the campus community. An educational experience that further encourages lifelong curiosity and learning, a sense of maturity and social responsibility, is one of the most important values an institution can instill in its graduates. By providing students with this array of educational opportunities, our students will be better equipped to promote the values learned at the University at Albany, long after their physical departure from the institution.
APPENDICES

Appendix 10.1 Summary of Recommendations

While many recommendations are program-specific, a few overarching themes became apparent during the review process which led to the following recommendations:

- The University provides many unique and interesting options for students to obtain a well-rounded education by developing skills, building professional networks and gaining valuable experience beyond the classroom. From an evaluation perspective, many of these programs form a patchwork of opportunities across the fabric of the institution. What appears absent is an element of cohesion. The University should consider ways to provide the campus community with a holistic view of the related educational activities that are available to the variety of campus constituencies.

- The University should give further thought to how related educational activities are promoted. Programs which target specific populations, such as EOP, IELP, PDP and UHS, have well-defined criteria that guide students to these opportunities, but this is less obvious with voluntary, related educational activities. Many of these programs appear to depend on self-promotion and may benefit from the broader institutional support and dissemination of information.

- A related consideration is developing a supplementary packet of materials on these programs for all academic advisors. This would help get the same information into the hands of all University personnel who provide students with advisement. Paths should be clearly defined to help make students more broadly aware of all their options; some may benefit from additional encouragement from their academic advisors. At a minimum, the institution should expand its communications pertaining to related educational activities. Complete and accurate information on related educational activities should be available to all interested parties.

- Information about related educational opportunities need not be limited to the campus community. The Capital Region provides a rich backdrop for the University to play a more prominent role in establishing community connections; related educational activities attract prospective students to the institution and build new partnerships with organizations throughout the region, further advancing the University’s standing in the community.

Additional recommendations include:

- The University should assess the institutional value of related educated activities and evaluate their importance to the overall student experience. The campus should consider engaging in a broader discussion about how these activities contribute to learning outcomes and educational goals. If there is agreement that studying overseas or participating in community service are important elements of a good education, the campus may wish to identify avenues leading to greater levels of participation.
By further encouraging or formally approving the inclusion of related educational activities in academic programs, the University can send an explicit message that such opportunities are relevant to the academic experience.

Strongly recommended is an expanded collection and evaluation of data regarding the success of students who participate in related educational activities. The campus maintains data in some areas (e.g., retention rates in EOP) but does not seem to gather information in others. Would it be useful to know the percentage of graduating students who have participated in one or more of the programs discussed in this chapter? Would such information help the University develop a more holistic picture of how related educational activities benefit the overall curriculum? If so, would this information help the institution determine whether there should be greater support for such activities? If any of these questions are answered in the affirmative, these areas should be explored.

The majority of related educational activities at the University are currently focused on undergraduates. Many of the student support services and experiential learning opportunities could be beneficial to graduate students. The University should consider integrating some of these activities into graduate programs. Although some of the related educational activities such as University in the High School courses are not possible at the graduate level, study abroad and community service programs might be a valuable curricular addition at the graduate level. Similarly, while some graduate programs already include internship requirements (or opportunities), there may be others where internships would be a valuable curricular addition.

In order to better assess whether the University offers related educational activities that are appropriate for its student population, the campus may wish to explore soliciting student input. This may provide additional insight to new opportunities.

Program-specific recommendations are as follows:

**EOP:**

- Consider evaluating EOP to determine whether retention rates after three semesters can be increased.
- Explore how the EOP model facilitates an atmosphere of motivation and encouragement, and how this might be incorporated to a more holistic student experience across the University.

**IELP:**

- Define and track performance, retention and graduation rates for students who continue their studies at UAlbany.
- Conduct periodic reviews of TOEFL and IELTS exams and UAlbany scores.
- Assess non-native graduate student performance on comprehensive exams, theses and dissertations and teaching assignments.

**University Internships:**

- Evaluate how students across disciplines are made aware of internship opportunities and consider increased promotion.
- Consider the value of tracking internship placements.

**Other Non-Credit Offerings:**
• Evaluate how students learn about these opportunities.
• Define the value of statistics gathered for these offerings.
• Determine whether these activities have regular assessment.

Study Abroad:
• Evaluate how students are made aware of opportunities and consider increased promotion.

Appendix 10.2 – EOP Eligibility Requirements

Academic requirements for freshman admission to UAlbany's EOP program include an official high school transcript or an official General Equivalency Diploma (GED) score report. In addition, all freshman applicants must submit their SAT or ACT exam scores. An applicant's grade-point average (GPA) must be between 80 and 89.

SAT (Critical Reading + Math) must be between 800-1000, and a minimum of 400 on Critical Reading.

Academic requirements for transfer admission to Albany's EOP program require a student to have been enrolled previously in an EOP, HEOP, SEEK, College Discovery program or similar academic and financial support program at their previous college and all institutions attended. A minimum of an overall 2.5 grade point average is required for all EOP transfer students. If not admitted to EOP, students may be eligible for other support programs offered by the OASS.

Appendix 10.3 – Programs Offered by the Center for Public Health Continuing Education (CPHCE)

Basic Environmental Health Program
Chronic Disease
Grand Rounds Clinical
Breast Exam Training
Institute for the Advancement of Healthcare Management
Introduction to Public Health
MDS Training
Public Health Broadcast Series Programs
Public Health Preparedness
Surveillance Training Academy
Women's Health Training Project

Appendix 10.4 – Other Non-Credit Offerings

Definitions and Criteria

• Vocational and Professional Training: training that is directed at developing the career-related skills and knowledge of individuals in a vocation, e.g., computer technician, health aide, etc., or in a profession, e.g. manager, nurse, lawyer, etc.

• Remedial Instruction: activities which do not report imputed credit courses or learning center developmental activities that are reported in the for-credit FTE's; all other non-credit remedial activities, such as communications, GED, study skills, math, reading,
writing, ESL, entry level computer skills, etc., not offered for imputed credit on the NCIA under remedial instruction

- Other: includes avocational non-credit instructional activities that do not fit into the other categories; includes self-improvement, leisure and personal enrichment, and community service instructional activities

- Business and Industry Training: any type of non-credit training/instruction developed for or provided to a business or industry; includes public, private and not-for-profit organizations, such as other educational institutions and government agencies, as well as local businesses and industries; training usually formalized by a contract and oftentimes customized to the needs of a specific business, organization or institution

Activities which meet these criteria have included:

- Professional Development Program: particular offerings elaborated elsewhere in this chapter, but in addition in 2007-08 there were reported 3,749 non-credit instructional activities, with a total of 93,321 registrations; highest in demand subject areas: child care provider training, temporary assistance examiner training, computer skills training, child welfare worker training, and child welfare documentations system (CONNECTIONS) training; offered activities utilized most often by: NYS Office of Children and Family Services; NYS Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance, NYS Department of Health; NYC Human Resources Administration; and the AIDS Institute

- School of Public Health, Office of Continuing Education: in 2007-08, 93 non-credit instructional activities reported, with a total of 49,034 registrations; highest in demand subject areas: Public Health Live Series, Center for Public Health Preparedness Series, orientation to public health, breastfeeding grand rounds, and oral health during pregnancy. Offered activities utilized most often by: Healthcare professionals associated with public and private agencies and organizations; NYSDOH local health department personnel; NYSDOH surveyors; long-term care facilities staff; and hospital staff

- Small Business Development Center: in 2007-08, 26 non-credit instructional activities reported, with an unknown number of registrations; areas for these activities included in the past: pre-business planning, Veteran Resource Day, legal issues for small business, international trade, and real estate leasing

- New York State Writers Institute: in 2007-08, three non-credit instructional activities reported; 52 registrations in creative writing

- Disability Resource Center: in 2007-08, three non-credit instructional activities reported; 898 registrations in the areas of "Recipe for Success High School to College Transition" and "Summer College Experience"

- General Studies: in 2006-09, one non-credit instructional activity reported; unknown number of registrations, in the area of piano lessons
Appendix 10.5 – Study Abroad Participating Countries

Argentina, Belize, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Guatemala, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Puerto Rico, Russia, Singapore, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Taiwan, Tanzania, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom

Appendix 10.5 – University in the High School

Current Course Offerings

College of Arts and Sciences:

Department of Africana Studies
A Aas 219 Introduction to African American History
A Aas 240 Classism, Racism, and Sexism: Issues

Department of Art
A Arh 170 Survey of Art in the Western World I
A Arh 171 Survey of Art in the Western World II
A Art 105 Beginning Drawing
A Art 110 Two-Dimensional Design
A Clc 110 Classical Roots: Great Ideas of Greece and Rome

Department of Atmospheric and Environmental Sciences
A Atm 100 The Atmosphere

Department of Biological Sciences
A Bio 102 General Biological Sciences
A Bio 117 Nutrition
A Cas 100 Contemporary Issues in Life Sciences
A Cas 109 Int. Science Research
A Cas 110 Int. Methods of Research
A Cas 209 Adv. Science Research
A Cas 210 Adv. Methods of Research

Department of Chemistry
A Chm 120 General Chemistry I
A Chm 124 General Chemistry Lab I
A Chm 121 General Chemistry II
A Chm 125 General Chemistry Lab II

Classics Program
See Department of Art
See Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures

Department of Communication
A Com 238 Introduction to Mass Communication

Department of East Asian Studies
A Eac 201 Intermediate Chinese I
A Eaj 102 Elementary Japanese II
A Eaj 201 Intermediate Japanese I
Department of Economics
A Eco 202 The American Economy: Its Structure and Institutions

Department of English
A Eng 100Z Introduction to Analytical Writing
A Eng 121 Reading Literature
A Eng 144 Reading Shakespeare
A Eng 222 World Literature
A Eng 226 Focus on a Literary Theme, Form, or Mode
A Eng 261 American Literary Traditions
A Eng 295 Classics of Western Literature
A Jrl 100 Foundations of Journalism and Media Studies
A Jrl 200Z Introduction to Reporting and News Writing

Department of History
A His 100 American Political and Social History I
A His 101 American Political and Social History II
A His 130 History of European Civilization I
A His 131 History of European Civilization II
A His 220 Public Policy in Modern America
A His 250 The Holocaust in History
A His 259 History of Women and Social Change

Department of Judaic Studies
A Jst 250 The Holocaust in History

Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures
A Cll 102 Elementary Latin II
A Cll 201 Introduction to Latin Literature I
A Fre 221 Intermediate French I
A Fre 222 Intermediate French II
A Ger 201 Intermediate German I
A Ger 202 Intermediate German II
A Ita 103 Intermediate Italian I
A Ita 104 Intermediate Italian II
A Rus 201 Intermediate Russian I
A Rus 202 Intermediate Russian II
A Spn 103 Intermediate Spanish I
A Spn 104 Intermediate Spanish II

Department of Latin American, Caribbean and U.S. Latino Studies
A Lcs 201 Latino USA
A Lcs 229 Special Topics in Latin American and Caribbean Studies
A Lcs 240 Classism, Racism, and Sexism: Issues
A Lcs 289 Special Topics in Ethnicity

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
A Mat 100 Precalculus Mathematics
A Mat 101 Algebra and Calculus I
A Mat 105 Finite Mathematics
A Mat 108 Elementary Statistics
A Mat 112 Calculus I
A Mat 113 Calculus II
A Mat 214 Calculus of Several Variables
A Mat 220 Linear Algebra

Department of Music
A Mus 100 Introduction to Music
A Mus 110 Basic Music Theory
A Mus 245 Theory I

Department of Physics
A Phy 100 Contemporary Astronomy: The Cosmic Connection
A Phy 105 General Physics I
A Phy 108 General Physics II
A Phy 140 Physics I: Mechanics
A Phy 150 Physics II: Electromagnetism

Department of Psychology
A Psy 101 Introduction to Psychology

Department of Sociology
A Soc 115 Introduction to Sociology
A Soc 289 Special Topics in Ethnicity

Department of Theatre
A Thr 107 Introduction to Dramatic Art

Department of Women's Studies
A Wss 240 Classism, Racism, and Sexism: Issues
A Wss 260 History of Women and Social Change

Other
A Cas 198 Special Topics in the Humanities

College of Computing and Information:

Department of Computer Science
I Csi 101 Elements of Computing
I Csi 102 Microcomputer Software
I Csi 201 Introduction to Computer Science

Rockefeller College:

Department of Political Science
R Pos 100 Introduction to Political Science
R Pos 101 American Politics

School of Business:
B Acc 211 Financial Accounting

School of Criminal Justice:
R Crj 202 Introduction to Law and Criminal Justice

School of Public Health:
H Sph 201 Introduction to Public Health

Other courses may be considered upon request.
**UHS Staff**
Gregory I. Stevens, Ph.D. - Assistant Dean, Academic Programs and Director, UHS
Karen L. Chico Hurst, M.B.A. - Associate Director for Administration, UHS
Carmela Miano Price - Assistant Director - Scheduling, UHS
Makenzie Frisino - Staff Assistant - Registration/Enrollment, UHS
Lana Stein, M.S. - Staff Assistant - Curriculum and Evaluation, UHS
Rhoda Drumm - Secretary, UHS

**UHS Liaisons**
Accounting: Michelle Moshier
Africana Studies: Marcia Sutherland
Art: JoAnne Carson
Atmospheric and Environmental Science: Vacant
Biology: Daniel Wulff
Chemistry: Paul Toscano
Classics: Richard Gascoyne
Classics: Gregory I. Stevens
Communication: Annis Golden
Computer Science: Seth Chaiken
East Asian Studies: Anthony DeBlasi
Economics: Vacant
English:
French: Véronique Martin
French: Susan Cumings
German: Karin Hamm-Ehsani
History: Laurie Kozakiewicz
Italian: Maria Keyes
Journalism: William Rainbolt
Latin: Richard Gascoyne
Math/Statistics: Timothy Lance
Math/Statistics: Tina Mancuso
Music: Reed Hoyt
Physics: Keith Earle
Political Science: Vacant
Psychology: Robert Rosellini
Russian: Charles Rougle
School of Criminal Justice: Julie Horney
School of Public Health: Dwight Williams
Science Research: Daniel Wulff
Science Research: Len Behr
Sociology: Richard Lachmann
Spanish: C. Aida Torres-Horwitt
Theatre: Vacant
Chapter 11: Epilogue

Introduction

As noted in Chapter 1, UAlbany began this self-study process with a goal of producing a document that would be seen as a comprehensive and forthright reflection on the current state of the University. It was also commenced with the expectation that the process, as well as the resulting document and recommendations, would strengthen the unity of the campus community and provide insights and renewed purpose for carrying out the institution’s mission in the years ahead. While acknowledging that the decade of self-study has been frequently characterized in terms of faculty and staff concern over the number of leadership transitions UAlbany has experienced, the University was aware that this process placed a renewed focus on the many positive changes which also have occurred during this time period. Indeed, one of the resounding themes that surfaced during a variety of recent planning processes, ranging from the University’s branding initiative to the Steering Committee on Community Engagement’s “Action Plan to Advance Community Engagement at UAlbany,” is that the University has not done enough to publicize its accomplishments and that, even on campus, UAlbany remains a “best kept secret.”

The self-study process thus provided a perfect opportunity to examine the University as a whole, to identify its strengths and weaknesses, and to give the campus an opportunity to make suggestions based on the findings of the study’s analyses. The goal of this final, brief chapter is to review the overall self-study process and to provide a concise assessment of the committees’ efforts with respect to the goals laid out in the Self-Study Design.

The Self-Study Design presented specific goals and objectives as follows:

1. To examine and assess the state of the institution’s current mission, goals, policies, procedures, structures, educational and related offerings and activities, research, teaching, assessment mechanisms, and resources
2. To empower a broad University constituency to participate in all aspects of the self-study process to ensure the maximum representation of various constituencies within the University and ownership of the process, its contents, and resulting recommendations
3. To identify the institution’s strengths and weaknesses relative to each of the accreditation standards, in light of the University’s mission and goals
4. To make specific recommendations for improvement, particularly in assessment, planning, and resource allocation processes

Assessment of Goal Accomplishment

Goals #1 and #3 above focus specifically on examining the University’s current mission, goals, policies, procedures, structures, educational and related offerings and activities, research, teaching, assessment mechanisms, and resources, as they relate to the accreditation standards. They also aim at identifying UAlbany’s strengths and weaknesses relative to these standards, and in light of the University’s missions and goals. The self-study’s ability to accomplish these goals...
has depended heavily on the ability to engage the campus in a conversation and to come to some level of consensus about these issues.

While there was no expectation that a campus with more than 5,000 faculty and staff and 18,000 students would come to complete agreement on all analyses and recommendations, the self-study process was designed to allow for maximal input and consideration of different perspectives. It began with a call for participation, sent to the campus in May 2008 through the faculty/staff listserv, and a request to student governance bodies. More than 100 people responded, providing first, second and, in some cases, third choices for specific committee participation. In all but a handful of cases, individuals’ requests were accommodated. Interestingly, most subcommittees drew individuals from across the campus, and none was dominated by individuals with expertise in that particular area — a feature that, as many people noted, was both an advantage and a disadvantage for the subcommittees’ work. That is, many noticed that although it took most members quite a bit of time to familiarize themselves with the units and processes they were studying, the self-study process benefited from having individuals who could look at the issues being raised with a “fresh set of eyes.”

The Steering Committee was assembled by examining the lists of individuals who had volunteered for the different committees as well as a list of individuals nominated by the University Senate; similar to the individual subcommittees, the Steering Committee included individuals from across the campus with a range of organizational positions. In June 2008, then Interim President George Philip met with the Steering Committee and charged its members to look carefully at all aspects of the University. He noted that committee members should not think of the self-study report as a report for the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, but instead as a report for a variety of audiences, most notably the University community; he urged Steering Committee members to work with their subcommittee members to produce a comprehensive document that would be open, honest, and candid in its assessment of the University’s strengths and weaknesses. At the time, it was assumed that this report would be a document to help orient a new president to the campus. Interim President Philip emphasized that this self-study should be a document of the entire campus, rather than a document crafted by upper-level administrators. He underscored the notion that by committee members taking a critical look at their institution, they would be more likely to develop constructive recommendations having both short-term and long-term impact on the University community.

The process of writing the self-study was designed to be iterative, allowing for appropriate input along the way. That is, the initial timeline identified several points where drafts would be made available to various groups, a process that was facilitated by the development of a wiki site to allow easy access to the various documents. During the spring 2009 semester, initial drafts were reviewed by the co-chairs to ensure that the subcommittees were appropriately focusing on the self-study design questions and that the analyses used to assess performance against accreditation standards and the resulting recommendations were evidence based. Later that semester, all members of all subcommittees were asked to review drafts of chapters of other subcommittees and to identify gaps or overlaps in coverage of the charge questions. During the summer, campus administrators were given access to the drafts of the nine chapters addressing the accreditation standards, and their feedback was shared with the various subcommittees. A complete draft report was then made available to the full campus in November 2009, and, while all faculty, staff
and students had the opportunity to comment on any chapter, each council of the University Senate was asked for feedback on one or more specific chapters based on their area of interest. In addition, two open forums were held in order solicit in-person feedback on the self-study document. Attendance at these public events was low, but a count of “hits” on the self-study Website shows that the draft self-study document was visited over 10,700 times during the open comment period, suggesting that the document was indeed widely viewed. All of the feedback received from individuals and Senate councils was transmitted to the subcommittees for their consideration in preparation of the final version of the document.

In the end, a report was developed that the University believes is open and honest, and reflects a wide variety of perspectives from a broad array of campus constituents, consistent with Goal #4 enumerated above. Perhaps most importantly, from an assessment perspective, the report reflects that the subcommittees took seriously their charge to develop evidence-based recommendations to address areas in need of improvement. In some cases, subcommittees found strong evidence pointing to a need to address a particular issue; clear recommendations are provided. In other cases, subcommittees found that the evidence could be interpreted in a variety of ways, and, so, the report reflects a need for further reflection on the part of those closest to the particular issue. Finally, in still other cases, subcommittees found a need for additional data collection and analysis and thus made recommendations for more regular assessments with specific campus units.

It should be noted that while the list of specific recommendations grew rather lengthy, as summarized in the appendices to each chapter, a number of common themes cut across many of these proposals. The themes include: the need for more effective communication about key decision-making processes and for greater transparency surrounding them, especially with respect to decisions pertaining to resource allocation; the need to revisit longstanding practices that might be fostering a stifling institutional inertia; the need to encourage more widespread participation across the range of governance structures and on the part of the diverse constituencies of the University community; and the need to expand and formalize rigorous assessments of programs, units, and policies, and to disseminate widely the results of such assessments to inform planning. The formulation and compilation of the detailed and specific recommendations contained in the self-study document should serve the University well as it moves forward under new leadership.

**Conclusion**

This self-study concludes with a very basic idea, but one that is most important to keep at the forefront of our thinking — a reminder that the self-study report provides only a snapshot of a vast array of dynamic and constantly evolving processes. In the final months of writing and editing, as new activities and events emerged, it became increasingly difficult to put closure on the document — to refrain from including yet “one more important development.” Perhaps foremost among these developments is the Strategic Planning Process that was initiated this past fall. While the University’s Strategic Planning Process is already well underway, it has not been possible to track its initial progress in this document.

Nevertheless, by following then-Interim President Philip’s advice to develop a document that is not seen simply as the fulfillment of a mandate for the accrediting institution, but rather as a tool
to serve the broader needs of the campus, the University can be confident that this self-study is one that will benefit UAlbany in many ways going forward. That includes providing a strong foundation for the current Strategic Planning process as well as for other planning initiatives that will emerge over the coming years.