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Mission of The State University of New York (Chapter 552, Laws of 1985)

The mission of the state university system shall be to provide to the people of New York educational services of the highest quality, with the broadest possible access, fully representative of all segments of the population in a complete range of academic, professional and vocational post-secondary programs including such additional activities in pursuit of these objectives as are necessary or customary. These services and activities shall be offered through a geographically distributed comprehensive system of diverse campuses which shall have differentiated and designated missions designed to provide a comprehensive program of higher education, to meet the needs of both traditional and non-traditional students and to address local, regional and state needs and goals. In fulfilling this mission, the state university shall exercise care to develop and maintain a balance of its human and physical resources that:

a. recognizes the fundamental role of its responsibilities in undergraduate education and provides a full range of graduate and professional education that reflects the opportunity for individual choice and the needs of society;

b. establishes tuition which most effectively promotes the university's access goals;

c. encourages and facilitates basic and applied research for the purpose of the creation and dissemination of knowledge vital for continued human, scientific, technological and economic advancement;

d. strengthens its educational and research programs in the health sciences through the provision of high quality care at its hospitals, clinics, and related programs;

e. shares the expertise of the state university with the business, agricultural, governmental, labor and nonprofit sectors of the state through a program of public service for the purpose of enhancing the well-being of the people of the state of New York and in protecting our environmental and marine resources;

f. promotes appropriate program articulation between its state-operated institutions and its community colleges as well as encourages regional networks and cooperative relationships with other educational and cultural institutions for the purpose of better fulfilling its mission of education, research and service.”
Message from the Chancellor

In 1995, the Legislature called upon the Board of Trustees to craft a series of recommendations to enhance the quality and operational performance of the State University of New York. That work coalesced into the Board’s landmark plan: Rethinking SUNY. As is made abundantly clear in this Master Plan, much of Rethinking SUNY has been translated into action that has dramatically strengthened the State University. For example, the first cycle of Mission Review — the University’s core academic strategic planning process, now nationally recognized as a “Best Practice” in higher education — was brought to a successful conclusion in spring 2001. And, the University has adopted a system of performance-based budgeting which allows campuses to retain the tuition they generate and creates new incentives for the distribution of State funding to the campuses in ways that promote quality. Both initiatives rest on principles articulated in Rethinking SUNY. But there is more work to be done, and that too is described in this Master Plan.

When I joined the State University as Chancellor, I knew that the major objective of the Board of Trustees was to move the University into the front ranks of American higher education. That is a goal I enthusiastically embrace. The better the University becomes, the more successful it will be in attracting the top faculty, researchers, and students necessary for our State’s economic vitality. Fortunately, I joined the State University while Mission Review, an unprecedented and massive process involving all 64 campuses, was underway, allowing me to work with campuses to shape their goals and, through the campuses, the goals of the University. The executed final planning documents (Memoranda of Understanding) will be critically important as we continue to strengthen and improve the quality of the State University.

In addition to Mission Review, several new efforts launched recently continue to enhance the University's strength. We are taking steps to give the State University a new presence in Washington and to refocus the Research Foundation to support more directly research efforts on SUNY’s campuses. We are developing programs that will help the University match — and perhaps exceed — the levels of support given to other great public university systems. And, we created an Office for Business and Industry Relations to make the intellectual expertise of the University more readily available to companies, small businesses, and non-profit endeavors across New York State and beyond its borders.

With each of these initiatives underway, we must now set new goals for the future, cognizant of the fact that we need not be defined by the limits of the State
resources available to us. Accordingly, we intend to raise, across the breadth of the University, $1 billion in the next four years from private sources, including alumni, private corporations, and foundations. We also seek to increase sponsored research at the University to $1 billion per year within five years. Finally, it is our intention to increase campus-generated revenues by over $500 million in the next four years by, for example, growing out-of-state and international enrollment and by increasing the entrepreneurial activities of our campuses.

Unlike any other institution of higher learning in New York State, the State University is literally everywhere, from Niagara Falls to the top of the Adirondack Park, from the heart of one of the most vibrant cities on Earth to the last lighthouse on Long Island. Given our geographic and intellectual breadth, our success is the State's success. As the State University moves to the front ranks of American higher education, we also join in the greater effort to assure a strong future for the Empire State.

Robert L. King, Chancellor
In December 1995, the State University Board of Trustees responded to a call from the New York State Legislature requesting a “multi-year, comprehensive, system-wide plan to increase cost efficiency in the continuing pursuit of the highest quality and broadest possible access consistent with the state university mission.” The Board of Trustees, in its plan entitled *Rethinking SUNY*, reaffirmed the statutory mission of the University. It endorsed additional propositions that *The State University of New York Master Plan 2000-2004* also carries forward:

✦ The State University exists to provide access to educational services of the highest quality;
✦ Increased differentiation of campuses is fundamental to realizing the synergies achievable as a System;
✦ Graduate, professional, and research programs are essential to the mission of the State University of New York and to the economic vitality of New York; and
✦ Clearer academic standards and better means for measuring performance are central to increasing accountability.

The direction of the University established by the Board of Trustees in *Rethinking SUNY* has been pursued diligently in the succeeding years and continues to drive the priorities presented in this Master Plan: quality, access, efficiency, effectiveness, and accountability. To ensure access to the highest quality education in a climate of constrained resources, the University will continue to become more self-sufficient, more focused, more creative, and stronger. The priorities of the State University Board of Trustees assume a particular significance given the goals in the plan of the Board of Regents, *Excellence and Opportunity for All New Yorkers: The Statewide Plan for Higher Education, 1996-2004*.

Underscoring the momentum of *Rethinking SUNY*, this Master Plan sets out specific forward-looking objectives which will contribute to the statewide goals. The Master Plan is organized around four principal loci of effort across the University, each of which is intended to enhance academic quality:

✦ Mission Review
✦ Service to Local Regions, the State, and the Nation
✦ Financial Management
✦ Operations

In addition to the plans and activities described in the body of the text under the four foci, there are several reports and other supporting materials in the Appendix that provide more detail about the University’s future direction.

In short, *The State University of New York Master Plan 2000-2004* is a description of the successes the State University of New York has achieved during the past five years in implementing *Rethinking SUNY*. More importantly, it sets out how the State University will continue to translate the principles of *Rethinking SUNY* into action.
Mission Review – An Overarching Structure to Enhance Academic Quality

Since 1998, Mission Review has been the core academic strategic planning process of the State University. It is an on-going, campus-based effort that includes all 64 SUNY institutions both individually and collectively as part of geographic regions and sector groups. The aim of the process is to enhance academic quality by helping campuses clarify institutional goals, determine how best to pursue those goals, and identify specific benchmarks of success. Envisioned by Rethinking SUNY, Mission Review seeks to:

✦ Ensure the highest levels of academic quality across the University;
✦ Focus on the fundamental aspects of campus missions;
✦ Encourage campuses to think strategically about their roles within SUNY, New York State, and the nation;
✦ Enhance campus distinctiveness and differentiation;
✦ Enhance the reputation of each campus relative to regional and national peers;
✦ Foster cooperation with other campuses; and
✦ Identify goals and benchmarks to monitor success.

Mission Review is an unprecedented effort—in terms of its scope and detail—that has received broad support and is recognized by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) as a “Best Practice” in Quality Assurance (see Appendix, Mission Review Recognized). It is characterized by, and premised on, iterative dialogue between System Administration and the campuses.

The Mission Review Process (shown on the next page) illustrates the iterative, back-and-forth nature of the effort, its comprehensiveness (i.e., includes planning at the institution, sector, and regional level), and its inclusiveness (bringing together all different constituencies).
The first cycle of Mission Review included more than 70 meetings, both individual visits to campuses and broader gatherings of campuses by geographic region and institution type. Results of Mission Review are brought together in Memoranda of Understanding (MOU); these documents—signed by campus and System leadership—lay out campus goals, plans, and benchmarks of success. The MOUs provide a framework for facilitating changes in and enhancements to campus missions.

The Memoranda of Understanding articulate commitments on the part of campuses and System Administration toward the goal of achieving the highest possible academic quality for the State University. In the aggregate, they chart a course that is focused on high standards for academic quality and public accountability on the one hand, and campus autonomy and self-determination on the other. Where clear quantifiable goals could be specified, campuses have done so (e.g., retention and graduation rates). In other instances, campuses have committed to put in place and/or enhance campus-based procedures that will improve quality (e.g., regular external review of all academic programs). Some of the commitments made in MOUs will be fully realized once complementary System-wide initiatives are fully implemented (in such areas as general education, research, and assessment). The MOUs will serve as important reference and policy documents for stakeholders throughout the University. Examples of ongoing efforts that will rely extensively on the Memoranda of Understanding include presidential evaluations, academic program proposal review, enrollment planning, and performance funding.
Although each Memorandum of Understanding lays out a plan specific to a campus, the complete set of these documents establishes a vision for enhanced academic quality throughout the State University. Certain key themes emerge across these planning documents; the following pages highlight some of the components anticipated to have the most dramatic impact on quality.

Perhaps the most important step in Mission Review was the first: each campus was asked to clarify its mission and role within the University. Clear delineation of mission “envelopes” is useful, both to campus constituencies and to the broader constituency base of the State University. Campuses have defined their market niches in relation to their historic mission, geographic considerations, the range of academic degrees that are offered, and particular institutional strengths. This information is made explicit in the Memoranda of Understanding which, in turn, serve as useful reference documents for determining the appropriateness of newly proposed academic programs.

In addition to mission differentiation at the institutional level, Mission Review also sought to clarify missions of various campus sectors across the State University. The SUNY system includes eight distinct categories of institutions (see Appendix, List of Campuses) which maximize the provision of quality higher education to New Yorkers. Having such a broad range of institutions enhances each citizen’s ability to contribute to society, participate in the workforce, and take advantage of lifelong learning opportunities. Mission Review reaffirmed the value of different sectors, which include:

**Four University Centers**
The four university centers—at Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo, and Stony Brook—are, first and foremost, research institutions where the creation of new knowledge is a central part of campus mission. In addition to wide-ranging undergraduate and graduate programs leading to baccalaureate and master’s degrees, each university center has doctoral programs and professional schools.

**Thirteen Comprehensive Arts and Sciences Colleges**
This group comprises twelve traditional institutions, mostly located in small cities and towns, with academic offerings that include liberal arts and sciences and professional programs such as business and teacher education. In addition to a full range of undergraduate curricula, including honors programs, the comprehensive colleges offer masters degrees. The thirteenth—less traditional—comprehensive college is Empire State College, which enrolls a high proportion of working adults at extension centers throughout the state and via distance learning.

**Four Health Science Centers**
The State University’s four health science centers (HSCs) include two freestanding centers, in Syracuse and Brooklyn, and two university-based centers at the University at Buffalo and the University at Stony Brook. Three of the HSCs (Syracuse, Brooklyn, and Stony Brook) include University-owned hospitals. Each health science center has a college of medicine, nursing programs, and a range of other health-related undergraduate and graduate programs. SUNY offers,
through these centers, some of the highest quality health-related education, research, and patient care in the nation.

**Six Colleges with Special Missions**
The six specialized colleges include the College of Environmental Science and Forestry, Farmingdale (focusing on technology and applied sciences), Maritime College, the College of Optometry, the Institute of Technology at Utica/Rome, and the Fashion Institute of Technology (FIT). FIT, a unique community college within the System, offers associate through master’s degrees. Each of these colleges focuses on degree programs related to their special mission and role.

**Five Partnership Colleges**
Known also as statutory colleges, the five partnership colleges include four colleges affiliated with Cornell University: the Colleges of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Human Ecology, Veterinary Medicine (graduate schools only) and the School of Industrial and Labor Relations. A fifth institution, the New York State College of Ceramics, is affiliated with Alfred University. Each partnership college enjoys the benefits of being part of the State University of New York while being connected to, and located at, a private university. These colleges are exemplars of productive public-private partnerships.

**Five University Colleges of Technology**
The five University Colleges of Technology (UCT)—located in Alfred, Canton, Cobleskill, Delhi, and Morrisville—are linked through a consortium that facilitates cooperative planning and delivery of academic programs and services. This creative partnership allows students at any one of the five campuses to participate in courses originating from another campus using distance learning technology. Thus, UCT students benefit from a wider array of academic offerings and faculty. The five UCT campuses offer associate degree programs, and an expanding number of baccalaureate programs in technology and applied science appropriate to their missions.

**Thirty Community Colleges**
The State University’s 30 community colleges are located in every region of the state. Students study in a range of two-year programs leading to the associate degree, and in certificate and other non-degree programs. Many of SUNY’s community college graduates transfer to four-year institutions to earn a baccalaureate degree, while other graduates begin work immediately. The community colleges also have a wide range of offerings and resources supporting programs in lifelong learning and skill development for part-time students already in the workforce, either individually or through employer-supported, tailored courses. A number of community colleges offer residential living, and several operate in more than one location. SUNY’s community colleges are different from its state-operated campuses in that governance and operation are shared between the state and local sponsor (i.e., a single county or a group of counties). State-local shared governance is reflected in the membership of community college boards of trustees: they include both Governor-appointed and local sponsor-appointed members. Even though this governance difference exists, the community colleges are fully involved in a comprehensive planning process that is completely consistent and fully coordinated with the overarching system-wide strategic goals.
Related Educational Centers

The University’s related educational centers include the statewide network of Educational Opportunity Centers (EOCs). With more than a 33-year history, EOCs have pioneered providing urban communities with innovative academic programs leading to higher education, and with vocational training programs leading to gainful employment and economic self-sufficiency. In 1999-2000, the EOCs offered training and support to over 16,000 individuals.

With enhanced academic quality as its guiding principle, Mission Review addresses enrollment planning from multiple angles, including setting realistic enrollment goals, specifying selectivity aspirations, and identifying benchmark institutions for comparative data. Campus plans to attract stronger students through initiatives such as merit scholarships and honors programs are also outlined in the Memoranda of Understanding.

As part of Mission Review, campuses were asked to consider carefully their short- and long-term enrollment plans in terms of both the size and the academic profile of their admitted student body. One of the outcomes of Mission Review is that a very rigorous enrollment planning process—one that takes into account campus goals and aspirations and progress toward those goals and aspirations—has been adopted by the Enrollment Planning Group in System Administration. This broadly representative group engages campuses in dialogue as needed and appropriate, and approves campus plans that are in concert with the thrust of the Memoranda of Understanding. Enrollment plans are evaluated for consistency with overall State University goals, previously expressed campus goals, demographic trends, campus capacity, workforce needs, funding constraints, and prior success in campus-based enrollment planning.

Projections for 2004-05 are that enrollments will rise to 174,240 full-time equivalent students in state-operated institutions (nine percent increase over 2000-01) and to 145,151 full-time equivalent students at community colleges (five percent increase over 2000-01), for a total of 319,391 full-time equivalent students (seven percent increase over 2000-01). Planned total headcount will rise to 400,737 students (seven percent increase over 2000-01). The table on the next page summarizes State University planned enrollment growth from 2000-01 to 2004-05, across sector, and in the context of projected New York State public high school graduates.
SUNY continually seeks to improve quality and increase the transparency of the enrollment planning process. To this end, clear guidelines describing the process and providing details about the methodologies used by the Enrollment Planning Group are distributed to all campuses. At the conclusion of the annual planning cycle, each campus is provided with a summary of all approved plans, as well as the plans and actual enrollments for all campuses for the previous two years. In this way, campuses receive more detailed information to support their own enrollment planning efforts.

The profile of an admitted class is another indicator of academic quality. Among the goals of Mission Review is enhancing the quality of students admitted to the State University of New York while maintaining the University’s long-standing commitment to access. To that end, all state-operated campuses have pledged to work toward enhanced selectivity and have committed to precise selectivity goals for entering classes. Campus-driven selectivity goals—informulated by state and national peer comparison data—are made explicit in the Memoranda of Understanding. The following chart illustrates the rubric used by campuses and System Administration to determine the selectivity goals for undergraduate admissions. With a defining criterion of “at least 60% of students” (admitted as full-time freshmen) for each selectivity group, the matrix leaves considerable room for access to even the most selective State University campuses.
As a result of Mission Review, the Memoranda of Understanding will be relied upon to determine not only whether a given campus is reaching its targeted enrollment goals but also its goals for undergraduate selectivity. Campuses will be asked to provide updated information on selectivity annually, as part of the enrollment planning process. All indications suggest that the integrated Mission Review and enrollment planning process is successful in meeting State University goals for 1) more accurate enrollment planning consistent with MOU goals, 2) raising selectivity (where appropriate) and maintaining access, and 3) facilitating collaborative and more transparent planning.

In addition to the profile of an admitted class, another indicator of academic quality is campus success in attracting students from a wide geographic area. As institutional reputation rises, applications from outside the campus’ local area expand. Accordingly, in the Memoranda of Understanding many campuses have committed to expanding their geographical “draw.” Their effectiveness in doing so will be monitored over time.

As a public institution, the University has a strong commitment to ensuring broad access and opportunity for New York State residents and that commitment was reaffirmed in Mission Review. In the coming years, the University plans to:

✦ strengthen and build upon existing programs for access;
✦ enhance outreach efforts to under-served populations;
✦ promote diversity among faculty, staff and students;
✦ address the technological needs of disadvantaged students;
✦ produce graduates well-prepared in fields corresponding to state needs (e.g., teaching);
✦ expand collaborative efforts with public schools in at-risk communities; and
✦ continue to support initiatives that combine the principles of access, service, and excellence at all levels of study.

At the center of the range of programs that serve as mechanisms for access, diversity, and student support is the University's highly successful Educational Opportunity Program (EOP). Designed for undergraduate students who have the potential to succeed in higher education despite economic and academic disadvantages, each year this program provides financial assistance, academic development skills workshops, advisement, and counseling to more than 11,500 students who might not otherwise have the opportunity for college-level study. As a complement to its undergraduate support programs, tuition waivers for study at the master’s, doctorate, and first-professional level at selected SUNY campuses dramatically expand career options for successful graduates from disadvantaged backgrounds. Students enrolled in the University's opportunity programs come from a variety of backgrounds—urban and rural—that is representative of the diversity found in New York State.
Though traditional forms of student support remain at the core of the University’s opportunity program operations, improvement of student performance, enhancement of the educational experience and promotion of innovation in service delivery are current priorities. New campus programs will include projects aimed at: increasing student-faculty interaction outside the classroom; providing greater access to and ease with technology; developing leadership skills among program students; integrating learning and living environments; fostering mentoring relationships; structuring opportunities for student participation in research and internships; encouraging alumni involvement; facilitating transfer from two-year to four-year programs; and encouraging graduate study.

The University’s Opportunity Programs group works jointly with the Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge (SEEK) program in the City University and occupies a leadership role in the Tri-State Consortium of Opportunity Programs—comprising access programs in the public and private institutions of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

Enhancing academic quality extends beyond attracting strong and capable students to include providing excellent instruction and a supportive learning environment until timely graduation. Consistent with Rethinking SUNY’s focus on time-to-degree, State University campuses will continue to improve their retention and graduation rates. Through Mission Review, campuses have committed to raising first-year retention rates, and four-year and six-year graduation rates.

### Student Retention and Graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-Year Retention Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Mean (Public) 74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-year Goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- University Centers
- Comprehensive Colleges
- Specialized Colleges
- Colleges of Technology
Most of SUNY's state-operated campuses meet or exceed the national mean first-year retention rate for public universities and colleges (see chart on previous page). Likewise, the average SUNY community college first-year retention rate (62.2 percent) far exceeds the national mean for public community colleges (52 percent). Nevertheless, each campus will strive to improve performance even further in this area. Initiatives include expanded first-year studies programs (e.g., Freshman Seminars), faculty mentoring of new students, placing students in supportive learning communities, and improved academic advisement. System Administration is committed to doing all that it can to support such efforts, including funding innovative approaches. Indeed, as part of Mission Review, campuses have received funding to support highly promising approaches to improving student retention. For example, the Colleges at Oswego and New Paltz will use Mission Review funds to invest in improved and enhanced academic programming for first-year students. Both campuses will adopt multi-pronged approaches that include faculty development and innovative, supportive programming aimed at beginning students. In this way, students will be better prepared to face academic challenges and more likely to persevere in their studies at the institution where they first enrolled.

The State University's six-year graduation rates at state-operated campuses also outpace the national mean for public colleges and universities (see chart below). Likewise, average SUNY community college four-year graduation rates (30.8 percent) substantially outpace the national mean (21 percent).

Once again, as part of the Mission Review process, all state-operated campuses have committed to specific goals for improving graduation rates. Where individual campus graduation rates fell below the SUNY mean, campuses committed to more careful analysis of attrition patterns (by interviewing withdrawing students, analyzing transcripts of students who leave prior to graduation, and careful review of student and alumni survey results, for example) in order to help improve their performance.
For community colleges in particular, retention and graduation rates must be interpreted in the context of student goals. Many community college students do not enroll seeking a degree but rather to acquire specific skills or knowledge (for example, by taking a set of specific courses related to one's job). Consistent with national efforts to focus on achievement of student goals in gauging success at community colleges, the Mission Review process has spawned an initiative to develop more comprehensive analyses of student intentions upon admittance and at subsequent points in their academic career. This System-wide effort will provide more accurate measures of community college effectiveness in helping students reach their academic goals.

Student retention and graduation are, of course, affected in important ways by financial pressures facing SUNY students. Consistent with its access mission, the University remains concerned about economic barriers that may prevent a student from attaining a quality higher education in New York. SUNY will continue to seek adequate levels of financial support through federal, state, local, and private sources so that students can stay in school and graduate in a timely manner, consistent with individual educational goals.

In addition to tracking retention and graduation rates as a matter of course through the System's Office of Institutional Research, campuses and System Administration will now also monitor these trends as part of the enrollment planning process.

A major function of the University's 30 community colleges is to provide students with access to an educational pathway leading to the baccalaureate degree and beyond. Each year, approximately 8,000 SUNY community college students transfer to upper-division SUNY institutions. Moreover, data indicate that transfers from SUNY's community colleges fare exceptionally well at our upper-division institutions, often outperforming those who began their education at these institutions as freshmen. Independent colleges also actively recruit and welcome SUNY community college graduates.

Each of SUNY's community colleges has negotiated detailed articulation agreements with their most prominent transfer partners, including both upper-division SUNY campuses as well as independent colleges. In addition to articulation agreements, many SUNY community colleges and their transfer partners offer jointly registered programs. Students in these programs are effectively admitted to the upper-division campus at the same time they are admitted to the participating community college.

Seamless articulation between community colleges and four-year institutions—a pillar of the University's mission—continues to be a high priority for the SUNY Board of Trustees and System Administration, and it was a major goal of Mission Review. Board policy ensures that students with an A.A. or an A.S. degree who are accepted into a parallel program by a SUNY baccalaureate institution will be granted full junior status and have the opportunity to complete their degree within two years of full-time study. Consistent with the high priority given to articulation, the Memoranda of Understanding include campus commitments
to tighten existing articulation agreements, develop new articulation agreements, develop more jointly registered programs, and increase inter-campus collaboration. This approach to seamless transfer is reinforced in the emerging community college strategic plan (see Appendix, The Community Colleges of The State University of New York Strategic Plan for 2001-2004).

As follow-up to Mission Review discussions, System Administration has formed a Transfer and Articulation Committee that is charged with monitoring and ensuring the implementation of relevant University policy as well as formulating recommendations for System-wide approaches to facilitate student movement within the University. Seven regional meetings were held in 2001 bringing together major transfer partners. Recommendations are forthcoming.

As part of Mission Review, each SUNY state-operated campus identified both current and aspirational peers. Identifying benchmark institutions for the purpose of making appropriate comparisons enhances academic quality by providing national context for viewing oneself. Also, implicit in the identification of “selected benchmark institutions” is the notion that evaluation of campus effectiveness must be supported by data. These benchmark institutions will be used to gauge individual campus quality improvement over time. The initial sets of benchmark indicators include: undergraduate enrollment; acceptance rate; SAT scores of entering students; high school grade point average; percent of full-time faculty; retention rate; graduation rate; and research funding. In the future, as more data become available and as campuses become more comfortable with the approach, the University will expand and refine the benchmarking process. And, of course, “peer” institutions will change as the quality and reputation of SUNY’s campuses are enhanced further.

In 1999, the Provost’s Advisory Task Force on the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes was charged with recommending a process for assessing student learning outcomes and intellectual growth in general education and the major across the State University. Following extensive research and deliberation and broad consultation with the University community, the Task Force submitted its Report to the Provost in November 2000 (see Appendix, Report of the Provost’s Advisory Task Force on the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes).

The Task Force report clearly identifies outcomes assessment as a cooperative venture between the faculty of the University and the academic leadership of campuses and System Administration. Recommendations call for a SUNY Assessment Initiative consisting of both campus-based and University-wide strategies. Consistent with the principles of Rethinking SUNY, emphasis is placed on campus-based assessment focusing on program improvement, and University-wide assessment focusing on accountability and advocacy. The proposed initiative is now well underway. Guidelines for the implementation of campus-based assessment of general education and the major were developed and distributed to campuses in December 2000. Campus-based assessment of the major will
begin in fall 2001, and campus-based assessment of general education will begin in 2002-03.

Preceding and concurrent with the Task Force’s work on assessment, Mission Review emphasized the importance of comprehensive assessment in enhancing academic quality. Consistent with the recommendations of the Task Force, campuses have committed in their Memoranda of Understanding to meaningful assessment efforts, specifically including regular assessment of academic departments/programs, and participation in System-wide surveys of students and alumni. System Administration and campuses are committed to working together to ensure the validity of data interpretation through, for example, consistent and clearly delineated procedures for administering survey instruments so that data are comparable year-to-year and across the System. Many SUNY institutions, especially the community colleges, will rely increasingly on employer satisfaction data as a key component of their assessment efforts, properly reflecting the workforce-training element of their mission. By using such surveys within a comprehensive assessment framework, campuses seek to ensure that they successfully meet expectations—held by recipients and beneficiaries alike—of a State University of New York education.

Expanding the level and distinction of the research enterprise within the University is an essential component of the University’s mission. Making new contributions to knowledge is and will remain at the heart of what the University does. It is also undeniable that world-class research promotes the stature of the State University and that enhancing the research environment on all campuses will enable the University to continue to attract the best and brightest faculty from around the world. Finally, University-based research directly and indirectly benefits the economy of New York (see also Research Foundation section under Service to Local Regions, the State, and the Nation).

Enhancing the research enterprise also enriches student learning. Superb research and teaching are closely interrelated and synergistic. Faculty who are actively engaged in creating new knowledge bring those insights to their teaching, at both a graduate and undergraduate level, and students are attracted by the opportunity to work with top-notch faculty researchers from whom they learn to do original work. Faculty researchers, in turn, benefit from explaining the importance and direction of their work to bright and inquisitive students. Indeed, student curiosity and fresh perspective can be catalysts for faculty research.

Mission Review provided an ideal forum for discussion of research goals with all campuses. During campus visits and in regional and sector meetings, the intellectual and pedagogical value of research and its positive impact on the state and national economy were priority topics for discussion. State-operated campuses were asked to look thoughtfully at their current research expenditures and to set specific goals for increasing research over a five-year period. Overall, the University has set an aggressive goal of reaching $1 billion per year in sponsored-research expenditures within the next five years. Each of SUNY’s campuses will play an important role in achieving this goal.
As a system, the University is carrying out a number of key initiatives to raise the level of funded research, including:

✦ Hiring faculty committed to research and giving a high priority to facilitating their research efforts;
✦ Providing a 20% match for every dollar of externally funded research activity (see also Financial Management – A Structure to Enhance Academic Quality);
✦ Working with the State University Construction Fund to secure capital funding for research (especially startup costs for new faculty) in future planning;
✦ Enhancing collaboration across SUNY and with peer institutions outside of the System;
✦ Working with New York businesses to emphasize the importance of research and the building of a state-wide research infrastructure;
✦ Working with the Legislature and the Governor’s Office to promote University-based research and the establishment of research initiatives in the 2001-02 budget and beyond; and
✦ More aggressively seeking federal support for research, in part through establishing a direct SUNY presence in Washington, DC (see Research Foundation section under Service to Local Regions, the State, and the Nation).

Academic quality and strong and distinguished faculties go hand in hand. The State University of New York is profoundly enriched by its faculty, who rank among the most accomplished educators and scholars in the nation. Their contributions are essential to fulfilling the University’s tripartite mission of instruction, research, and service. As part of Mission Review, campuses have made commitments to enhance the quality of faculty by:

✦ Increasing the proportion of faculty holding the Ph.D. degree at State University community colleges;
✦ Expanding external review of faculty scholarship in making promotion and tenure decisions;
✦ Expanding the use of student evaluations of the quality of faculty teaching; and
✦ Facilitating faculty scholarship.

System Administration has also committed resources to help support faculty development through the creation of a unit within the Provost’s Office charged with developing new programs and overseeing current initiatives that recognize and reward extraordinary performance by SUNY faculty. Recognition programs include the Chancellor’s Awards for Excellence and the Distinguished Faculty ranks in research, teaching, librarianship, and service. New efforts involve expansion of support for collaborative faculty research and greater involvement of distinguished faculty in planning and framing State University policy. In addition, the University’s Conversations in the Disciplines will be expanded to facilitate more cross-campus collaboration within disciplines. Tuition support for faculty and staff seeking advanced degrees is another area that will receive greater attention, to increase the proportion of faculty holding the Ph.D. degree.
Through joint and cooperative programming, the State University provides a wider range of instruction, research, and public service for a larger number of New York citizens than would otherwise be possible. In addition to intra-System collaboration, many State University campuses actively participate in regional organizations that involve non-SUNY institutions, including the Associated Colleges of the Mid-Hudson Area, Hudson-Mohawk Association of Colleges and Universities, Long Island Regional Advisory Council on Higher Education, Associated Colleges of the St. Lawrence Valley, Rochester Area Colleges, and Western New York Consortium of Higher Education. These organizations provide a vehicle for collaboration in the form of student cross-registration at participating campuses; joint workshops, symposia, exhibitions, and special projects; and shared use of expensive equipment and services among member institutions.

Coordinated inter-institutional activities have long had a place in SUNY, but the University now seeks to capitalize further on its system-ness by expanding such efforts. Increasingly, resources are shared, services jointly contracted for and other consortial arrangements established between State University campuses. In the area of campus operations, there are many vibrant cooperative business practices within the University. For example, campuses in the Western New York region have had a cooperative agreement since 1997 which commits them to collaborate in areas such as library storage, trademarks/licensing, legal services, printing, purchasing, training/staff development, and physical plant services. Joint purchasing is used among the campuses along the I-81 corridor, and the colleges of technology have undertaken a strong program of jointly developed marketing and outreach. In Rochester, the SUNY Student Resource Center is a joint venture between Monroe Community College, SUNY Brockport, Empire State College, and the Rochester Public Library that serves all of the respective communities. And, new facilities are increasingly being constructed with the needs of multiple communities (and campuses) in mind; the planned baseball facility at Hudson Valley Community College, with anticipated heavy usage by all of the counties in the Capital District, is a case in point. Many campuses intend to strengthen their ties to sister SUNY institutions in the area of facilities and operations, and these plans are specified in the MOUs.

As a result of Mission Review and other campus-driven initiatives, inter-institutional relationships are being further enhanced through such mechanisms as jointly registered programs and articulation agreements, scholarly exchanges, and multi-campus interdisciplinary research. For instance, while there are currently almost 500 jointly registered academic programs in the University, the Mission Review process encouraged campuses to increase that number as well as the number and specificity of articulation agreements, so that seamless transfer becomes a reality for more students. Jointly registered programs and detailed articulation agreements are particularly important in disciplines such as education and nursing, where shortages of professionals across the state and nation are reaching critical levels. Besides facilitating transfer and enhancing access, these programs are effective recruitment mechanisms for participating campuses, thereby increasing the mutual benefits of such collaboration.
Research is another increasingly important area of cooperation, as illustrated by the success of SUNY–private institution partnerships in newly funded academic research centers. State University campuses have led a number of such initiatives, often on a regional basis, aimed at fostering highly productive, cutting-edge collaborative research and development. For instance, in 2001 the University at Albany, in partnership with Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, was designated as a New York State Strategically Targeted Academic Research (STaR) Center to provide the science and technology resource base for the development of micro- and nano-electronics. Similarly, several other SUNY campuses, including the University at Buffalo, the University at Stony Brook, Cornell, the College of Environmental Science and Forestry, the Health Science Center at Syracuse, and Alfred State College, received support for collaborative initiatives from the New York State Office of Science, Technology and Academic Research (NYSTAR). In the MOUs campuses have committed to expanding collaborative research, and System Administration intends to facilitate such efforts (see Faculty Scholarship and Development).

The range and mix of academic programs in the State University of New York is ever evolving, aimed at meeting student and state needs while staying abreast of intellectual currents. Campuses periodically add new programs (see Appendix, New Programs of Study Tentatively Planned for Introduction 2000-2004), modify existing programs, and discontinue ones that are no longer appropriate. As part of the Mission Review process, each campus identifies priorities for program development that are consistent with its current and projected intellectual strengths and mission. Consistent with long-standing SUNY and State Education Department practice, proposals for new programs and/or revisions to existing programs are reviewed and approved by the University Provost on behalf of the State University Board of Trustees, before being submitted to the State Education Department for registration. With Rethinking SUNY's call for streamlining administrative procedures, the University's review process for new undergraduate programs was revised and streamlined in 2000-01 (see Appendix, Memo on 2001 Guidelines for the Submission of Undergraduate Academic Program Proposals). The new guidelines require that proposed programs be consistent with campus mission, reflect market need, and have demonstrable quality. System Administration has also committed itself to be accountable for meeting specific timeframes for various stages of the review process, and program proposals may now be submitted electronically. Similar enhancements to the graduate program review process are planned for 2001-02.

The State University believes that its graduates should have the general knowledge and skills necessary to participate in and contribute to a democratic society and to continually enrich their lives as educated individuals. The University seeks to inculcate such knowledge by a broad-based and coherent program of general education.

Resolution 98-241 of the State University Board of Trustees, passed in December 1998, mandated a minimum of 30 credit hours of general education coursework—
in 10 specified subject areas and two learning competencies—for all baccalaureate candidates within the University. This policy took effect for students entering in fall 2000, and every campus with undergraduate programs committed to meeting the requirements of this policy in the signed Memoranda of Understanding. In 1999, the University’s Provost convened an Advisory Task Force on General Education, comprised of faculty and administrators from across the University, to develop learning outcomes for each of the content areas and guidelines for implementation of the general education requirement (see Appendix, Report of the Provost’s Advisory Task Force on General Education). Subsequently, the Provost empanelled an Advisory Council on General Education (PACGE) to help review individual campus implementation plans to ensure that the letter and spirit of the resolution would be met.

Ongoing activities involving general education include:

✦ System interaction with newly formed SUNY General Education Directors Association;
✦ Development and recommendation of policies on transfer as it relates to general education;
✦ Identification of best practices in general education; and
✦ Refinement and improvement of extant guidelines for implementation of the Board policy.

Teacher Education

Teacher education was historically the centerpiece of many of the State University’s senior campuses, most of which originated as normal schools to train public school teachers. Although the missions of these institutions have evolved, the 16 campuses with teacher education programs remain committed to preparing superbly qualified teachers. The University takes justifiable pride in the strong reputation of its graduates who become teachers—a reputation built on outstanding performance on teacher certification examinations (see Appendix, SUNY Pass Rates on the New York State Teacher Certification Examinations 1999-2000) and, more importantly, success in the field.

Through its formal teacher preparation programs, the State University educates about 25 percent of the teachers certified through college and university programs in New York State each year. Additionally, a large number of SUNY graduates with non-education degrees later become certified as teachers through alternative processes. This accounts for an estimated additional 15 percent of the New York State certifications, bringing the total proportion of State University graduates to approximately 40 percent of the teachers certified annually through higher education institutions.

To help ensure the University’s continued leadership in the field of teacher education, the Provost established the Advisory Council on Teacher Education in December of 1999. The Council was asked to examine and make recommendations on: 1) aligning the supply of and demand for teachers (especially in high-demand subject areas such as math and science and in school districts with the greatest need),
2) ensuring that teacher education programs require intensive and relevant field experiences, 3) identifying research on issues of teaching effectiveness and learning, and 4) attracting the most academically capable students and accommodating well-educated individuals seeking to change careers and become teachers.

In March 2001, the Advisory Council issued its final report (see Appendix, Provost’s Advisory Council on Teacher Education Report and Recommendations) and the University now intends to vigorously pursue programmatic and policy directions set forth in that document. Toward that end, in June 2001, the Chancellor proposed and the Board of Trustees endorsed an action agenda outlining specific steps the University will take to facilitate the implementation of the Council’s recommendations. The three overarching goals of the agenda include: ensuring that all SUNY students pursuing teaching careers receive the best possible preparation to become effective teachers; addressing New York State’s need for teachers (particularly in high-need schools and specific disciplines); and continuing to accurately assess and improve SUNY’s teacher education programs. (See Appendix, A New Vision in Teacher Education: Agenda for Change in SUNY’s Teacher Preparation Programs for further details.)

The State University is committed to harnessing technology for the enhancement of instruction and learning, including innovative uses of technology in campus classrooms, laboratories, and libraries and through distance learning. The University has made significant progress in this regard during the past five years. Technological advancements for the near future include planning for the next iteration of SUNYNet—the University’s universal data communications network—and increased participation across the System in the rapidly growing Internet 2 community, linking the University with all the major colleges and universities, and research centers in the United States.

SUNY Learning Network
Since 1995, the University has emerged as a leader in online education as evidenced by the tremendous growth of its distance learning program: the SUNY Learning Network (SLN). SLN’s roots can be traced back to the Mid-Hudson Regional Learning Network—a project aimed at providing community college graduates in the Hudson Valley a means of completing their bachelor’s degrees without having to move to a state-operated campus. Although early plans called for instruction delivered exclusively by two-way video, following discussions with the Sloan Foundation (an early and generous supporter of the SLN initiative) the project’s emphasis shifted to delivering courses via the Internet.

In keeping with the tenor of Rethinking SUNY and a separate report of the State University Presidents Task Force on Distance Learning (1995), a number of strategic decisions were made to launch SLN, including:

✦ Campus participation would be voluntary;
✦ SLN would serve as a support infrastructure, not as a degree-granting entity;
✦ Campuses would emphasize full-degree programs, not just stand-alone courses;
Campuses would retain complete academic authority over offerings and would have responsibility for program, course, and faculty selection; Courses would be fully asynchronous, faculty-led and class-cohort-based; and SLN would ultimately become a self-sustaining program.

The SUNY Learning Network, now six years old, has one of the longest and most successful track records in online education. At its core, SLN provides a complete support infrastructure of faculty training and course development, course-management software and server infrastructure, and student and faculty help-desk services. It also provides SLN-wide marketing, promotion, and program management services to participating campuses. Course enrollments in SLN have increased from 119 in 1995-96 to more than 25,000 in 2000-01, and course offerings have grown from eight courses to more than 1,500 during the same timeframe (see chart, depicting growth in SLN courses). In addition, system-wide participation is up from just two campuses in 1995-96 to 47 campuses in 2000-01, and 53 campuses will offer courses in 2001-02.

Targeted growth in SLN offerings is one of the key components of the Mission Review Memoranda of Understanding. Many MOUs contain commitments for deepened involvement in the program. Over time, it is expected that SLN will also develop non-credit and non-degree learning modules aimed at businesses.

Libraries

Libraries are not only repositories of our collected knowledge, they are an essential tool for scholarship. Providing full access to that knowledge is an ongoing challenge — one which the State University is meeting head on by harnessing technology through its automated library initiative.

In 2000 the State University launched SUNYConnect, a bold new effort that electronically links all the libraries of the System, creating the largest library collection of any public university in the world (totaling over 18 million volumes). A major part of SUNYConnect is the installation of library management software that will create an Internet-accessible catalog of library materials, allowing searches
of all State University library collections. This software also provides a common
circulation process enabling students to directly access and borrow materials
from any SUNY library and receive them within two days. Significant savings
are anticipated from the creation of a common library management system and
reduced (unnecessary) duplication in library holdings.

The new system will organize and highlight journals and data provided through
the State University's Office of Library and Information Services, and also offer
direct access to hundreds of online journals now available at State University
libraries. Other projected features of SUNYConnect include: a comprehensive
collection of full-text, full-image and multimedia digital publications and services
that will be available at any time and from anywhere; a web-based information
literacy course; and shared regional storage and preservation facilities that will
ease space pressures in individual libraries. Additionally, the University is part of
a statewide, comprehensive, coordinated system of higher education resources
and distance learning programs, to which all New Yorkers will have access via
telecommunications and local libraries.

Steps Toward a Performance-Based Funding Model

The University's new budget model—driven by Rethinking SUNY and implemented in
FY1998-99 (see section, A Financial Management Structure to Enhance Academic
Quality)—gives campuses more autonomy, while still insisting on an appropriate
level of accountability. This model also rewards successful performance in areas
such as research productivity and enrollment management, and thus is
performance-driven in important ways. One of the long-term directions the
University plans to pursue in refining the budget model is a more explicit category
of funding that rewards campus achievement of goals relating to academic quality.

In 1997, as an offshoot of the budget model planning group, the Provost empanelled
an Advisory Task Force on Performance Indicators to develop measures to drive
the allocation of merit-based funding that recognize outstanding performance
and the achievement of campus goals. This task force conducted extensive
deliberations and proposed a series of measures based on analyses of SUNY data
sets as well as data from national sources.

The State University seeks to recognize outstanding performance in three areas:
(1) student achievement (e.g., graduation rates, student evaluations of the quality
of academic experience, and transfer student success); (2) faculty achievement
(e.g., scholarly productivity in terms of research and publication, and teaching
effectiveness); and (3) institutional services and environment (e.g., the quality
of campus services and facilities). Relying in large part on the work of this Task
Force, the University began a pilot program of performance awards in FY2000-01.
Because SUNY views enhancement of academic quality as its top priority, it plans
to expand and refine the performance indicator model, relying on recommendations
from its campus leaders. In the future, the model will reward improvement as well
as current high levels of performance; it will also incorporate more sophisticated
means for recognizing scholarship in the humanities and the performing arts.
Mission Review Funding

A commitment to academic quality has driven the entire concept of Mission Review, including the funding awards made through this initiative. Indeed, one of the foundations of the Mission Review process is that many campuses need additional—and transitional—financial support to achieve some of the goals they set for themselves. Put simply, Mission Review funding is used to support campuses in their efforts to realize the aspirations outlined in their Memoranda of Understanding.

In 2000-01, campus submissions for Mission Review funding totaled over $45 million. With $11.5 million in accumulated funds, support was provided to 29 campuses. Proposals were selected on the basis of academic merit, following rigorous review by a broadly representative System Administration committee, using the following criteria: demonstrable impact on academic quality; consistency with core mission; evidence of institutional commitment; extant institutional strength; sustainability of proposed project or initiative; measurability of outcomes/mechanism for accountability; positive extra-institutional effect; and potential for replicability as a “best practice.” Within this larger pool, a sub-pool of $2.5 million was earmarked to bolster doctoral programs by enhancing the competitiveness of Ph.D. student stipends; proposals for this sub-pool also underwent rigorous review, this time by a committee of campus experts (see Appendix, Mission Review Stipend Committee under Advisory Committees).

Mission Review awards necessarily entail precise conditions and terms, including the specification of how progress toward achieving project goals will be monitored. Because many campuses requested multi-year funding commitments, some awards were made over a period of three or more years; these campuses will have to achieve specified milestones before subsequent installments of funding are released.

The University intends to make annual awards of Mission Review funding, always on a fully competitive basis, to SUNY campuses. Follow-up monitoring and reporting on the effectiveness of these awards will ensure that these investments yield maximum benefit—not the least of which is enabling the supported programs to be recognized as “best practices.”
Service to Local Regions, the State, and the Nation

The economic impact of the State University is vast. Indeed, one might even regard the University as a $6 billion industry with 64 locations around the State. In many instances the State University campus is a region’s largest employer, providing a solid base of employment, educating the citizenry, working to build business and industry, and enriching the quality of life through cultural offerings. In addition, SUNY campuses draw students from outside the community who in turn add to the local economic base. The University also strengthens the business environment in New York via its Small Business Development Centers, through the creation of incubator facilities to foster high-tech industries, and through efforts to transfer the fruits of University research to industry.

Small Business Development Center
Since its establishment in 1984, the Small Business Development Center (SBDC) has helped create and save over 68,500 jobs in New York State. It has worked one-on-one with 156,000 clients who have, in turn, invested over $1.6 billion in their New York State businesses. Funded in part by the U.S. Small Business Administration and host campuses, the SBDC has 23 regional offices and 21 outreach offices located at the State University, CUNY, and private college campuses. In addition to providing business advice to New Yorkers, the SBDC works in partnership with other government agencies to open up opportunities for New York entrepreneurs.

Strategic Partnership for Industrial Resurgence
In 1996, the University’s engineering schools formed the Strategic Partnership for Industrial Resurgence (SPIR) to provide a vehicle for delivering advanced technical assistance to foster development of high-tech regions similar to California’s Silicon Valley or North Carolina’s Research Triangle. These regions grew through strong bonds between industry and universities, manifested most powerfully through university engineering schools. SUNY’s engineering schools hope to achieve similar results in New York. Since its inception, more than 2,600 SPIR projects have involved more than 1,000 companies. In 1998 alone, over 3,000 jobs were either retained or created due to 700 SPIR projects.

Central to the missions of the State University’s 30 community colleges is their role in workforce development. The Community College Workforce Development Training Grants program, aimed at stimulating economic growth throughout New York, provides funding for such efforts. The goal of the program is to promote and encourage the location and development of businesses in the state, and to create greater employment opportunities for individuals. Between 1999-2001, funding through the State University to 131 employer-approved projects provided job training for more than 12,000 employees. Most of the participating companies are small- to medium-sized businesses, from diverse fields such as manufacturing, building trades, health, e-commerce, service industries, tourism, and the fashion industry, to name a few. Every State University community college has participated in this program and, as a result, in 2000-2001
an estimated 470 jobs were created and 6,000 positions retained. A required match of at least 25% from participating business multiplied the effect of these grants. SUNY will continue to seek support for this program. This pivotal role in workforce development is prominently reflected in the Community College Strategic Plan (see Appendix), which calls for further enhancement of these efforts.

Charter Schools
The New York State Charter Schools Act of 1998 granted the State University Board of Trustees authority to approve up to 50 new public charter schools. Charter Schools are innovative public schools of choice created by parents, educators, civic leaders and other community leaders, open to all students and designed to improve learning. Operating under a five-year license, or charter, these schools are freed from most of the state laws, rules, and regulations controlling public education. This allows them greater flexibility in determining curriculum, staffing, hours, budgeting, and other features. In return for this flexibility, public charter schools must set measurable goals for student achievement or face revocation of their charter.

The SUNY Board of Trustees created the Charter Schools Institute to administer its responsibilities under the Charter Schools Act. The Institute oversees the review of applications and monitors the progress of schools that have been granted charters. To date, the Institute has received nearly 160 applications for charters, of which the University Trustees have approved 25.

Research Foundation
Research conducted at the State University not only contributes new knowledge and understanding, and leads to economic growth, but also frequently addresses significant social problems. Thus, SUNY research is a vehicle for service to the people of New York, the nation, and the world.

The Research Foundation of the State University of New York is a private, non-profit educational corporation whose primary responsibility is the administration of externally funded contracts and grants for and on behalf of the University. Since its establishment in 1951, the Research Foundation has facilitated research, education, and public service at SUNY's state-operated campuses. Consistent with the principles of Rethinking SUNY, the Research Foundation provides the administrative flexibility and expertise to respond quickly to the special demands and needs of sponsored programs. To support campuses effectively, the Foundation is governed by a Board of Directors which includes faculty researchers, campus leaders, and representatives from System Administration, as well as representatives from private business and industry.

In 1999-2000, SUNY's research expenditures for more than 7,500 sponsored programs (funded by governments, corporations, foundations, and other entities) totaled over $440.5 million, an eight percent increase over 1998-99. Projects sponsored by the federal government totaled $243.4 million, or 55 percent of total revenues, bringing substantial federal dollars to New York. Such research activity provided more than 16,000 full- and part-time research jobs statewide.
The Research Foundation works with SUNY faculty to move discoveries into the marketplace; its technology transfer program protects research findings and helps faculty market new technology and ideas by linking them to business firms. In 1999-2000, gross royalty income on University inventions reached a new high of $16.2 million and the State University was ranked among the top 12 U.S. universities for royalties collected from inventions licensed to industry. The University also reached a record level of patent activity in 1999-2000, with 68 U.S. patents awarded. With a total of more than 500 patented inventions, SUNY ranks among the top ten U.S. research institutions in the number of patents issued annually on inventions and discoveries.

SUNY’s research efforts also gain strong support from ongoing state initiatives. New York has recently substantially increased its investment in the research infrastructure that will enable its universities to become national leaders in key fields. For example, two incubator programs—the Center for Environmental Science and Technology Management (CESTM) at the University at Albany and the Long Island High Technology Incubator (LIHTI) at the University at Stony Brook—provide important educational resources for training scientists, engineers and researchers in such diverse areas as atmospheric chemistry and artificial intelligence. At the same time, these state-of-the-art facilities give start-up companies access to university libraries, computing support, and other important scientific and technological tools.

Promoting research is vital to enhancing the academic quality and stature of the State University, and in increasing the University’s contribution to the economic health of New York State and beyond. As noted previously, the State University intends to increase total sponsored activity to $1 billion per year within the next five years. Through Mission Review, campuses set specific goals for research and these goals are included in the Memoranda of Understanding. To ensure campus success in reaching research goals, the University will continue to provide support for research through its budget process and through initiatives such as Mission Review Funding. The Research Foundation will also play an increasingly important role in supporting the University’s aggressive research goals. Its efforts to establish a stronger SUNY presence in Washington, D.C. will help to maximize campus success in attracting federal grants.
Financial Management –
A Structure to Enhance Academic Quality

The State University has a responsibility to be an efficient and effective steward of the public resources entrusted to it. Rethinking SUNY was premised upon devolving more fiscal and operational control to campuses. Its guiding principles were increased management flexibility, better realization of System synergies, and reinvestment of savings in support of academic quality.

By 2000, several important initiatives begun as an outgrowth of Rethinking SUNY were fully operational, returning significant dividends to the campuses and the System. These initiatives showed results in the areas of budget, residence hall operations, campus-related foundations, general management practices and hospitals, as described below.

N light of Rethinking SUNY, the University designed and has put in place a new budget methodology for allocating and distributing the funding that supports University operations (see Appendix, State University of New York Budget Allocation Process). Fiscal year 2000-01 marked the final year of a three-year phase-in of the University's new budgeting process—a process designed to foster campus autonomy, recognize improved performance, and reward campus success in achieving their educational missions. Underpinning development of this performance-based budgeting was the goal of allowing campuses to retain and manage their own fiscal resources. (Conversely, campuses are required to assume greater responsibility for the costs of local decisions.) Key characteristics or objectives of the new methodology are:

- The campuses retain all tuition monies and other campus-generated revenue, encouraging entrepreneurial activity;
- The method for distributing student-enrollment support has been simplified: instead of categorizing enrollment level and type among 40 categories, enrollments are grouped into a cleaner and more predictable set of 12 categories based on actual and historic data on cost of instruction;
- The University matches every dollar of external research funds with 20% of additional funding, thus encouraging further growth in sponsored activity and an overall rise in SUNY’s research stature;
- The link between mission and funding has been tightened;
- Mission Review-based funds are distributed to enhance academic quality (see Mission Review Funding);
- Adjustments for the extraordinary costs of special programs are included;
- Campuses in metropolitan NYC receive a funding adjustment reflecting the higher costs they incur;
SUNY continues to recognize and support State-initiated institutes and land grant and forestry activities;

- The predictability of funding distributions (within the approved State budget levels) has been increased; and

- Perhaps most importantly, a high degree of transparency has been introduced into the process.

The State University core instructional budget for 2000-01 was $1,761.8 million. This was an increase of $110 million, or approximately seven percent, from the previous year. Tuition and fee revenue for the state-operated campuses and statutory colleges increased by $18 million in 2000-01, largely due to enrollment increases.

Future efforts to continue the refinement of budget methodology will focus, among other matters, on enhanced performance-based funding (see Steps Towards a Performance-Based Funding Model) and the distribution of state funds for University-wide programs. All new or improved distribution methodologies will be characterized by predictability, simplicity, accountability, campus involvement in methodology development, and constant emphasis on promoting academic quality.

The State University budget structure includes separate accounts for campus activity that is not included in the core instructional budget, generally referred to as Income Fund Reimbursable or IFR accounts. These accounts were previously charged maintenance and administrative overhead fees, set by System Administration. In an effort to move more fiscal control to the campuses, these overheads, which were previously pooled centrally, are now credited directly to the campuses along with interest earnings on the fund balances. Campuses now set the overhead rates for their IFR programs.

SUNY implemented new policies and guidelines for residence hall operations in fiscal year 1997-98, aimed at increasing efficiency by permitting campuses to manage directly more of their financial and program activities. Importantly, the guidelines require student participation in decisions pertaining to residence halls operations. With the new guidelines and policies in place, student demand for on-campus housing and residence hall rehabilitation and construction have all increased dramatically. Approximately $500 million in projects are scheduled over the next five years to meet the students’ needs for safe and comfortable housing. In 1999-2000, residence hall revenue increased $21.8 million, or 12 percent, over the previous year, as a result of increased occupancy and reasonable rate increases of approximately 4 percent overall.
Consistent with the need for the University to do effective fund-raising, solicit support from alumni, friends, and other patrons, foundations are assuming a more prominent and central role in the University’s future. Campus-related foundations derive the majority of their revenue from gifts and contributions in support of campus educational activities. In 1999-2000, support for campus-related foundations totaled $179.2 million, a 19 percent increase from the previous year. Total campus-related foundation net assets increased to $545 million, a 13.5 percent increase over the previous year. Of the $106.5 million expended in 1999-2000, about 73 percent supported scholarships, academic programs, and special events on SUNY campuses. The Chancellor has set a specific goal of $1 billion in private fund raising over the next four years and many campuses are in the midst of, or are planning, capital campaigns. A new council of SUNY Chief Advancement Officers has recently been established to share expertise regarding development programs and the Research Foundation has created a unit to help promote the quality and impact of campus-specific development efforts.

The State University achieved significant budgetary appropriation and execution authority in the mid 1980s, providing for a level of budgetary flexibility greater than that of other state agencies. Enhanced control over position management was also gained in the early 1990s. However, the University has made a continuing effort to acquire greater authority from external agencies in the execution of its financial and personnel resources and to delegate this authority to the campuses. These efforts can all be traced back to Rethinking SUNY, which called for enhanced management flexibility and devolution of authority to local, campus decision-makers. This thrust will continue to be a high priority for the University.

Over the past five years, the State University has been able to establish higher thresholds with external control agencies related to the competitive bidding process. As a result of these efforts, SUNY campuses need not acquire competitive bids for purchases below $30,000; must receive three written quotations for purchases between $30,000 and $75,000; and must receive at least five sealed bids for purchases over $75,000. Other state agencies are required to perform a formal competitive process for any purchases over $15,000.

The approval of contracts is another area in which the University has been able to obtain greater flexibility. The University is now only required to obtain prior approval from external agencies for contracts valued at over $150,000 (certain exceptions exist). Other agencies must receive prior approvals for contracts at significantly lower amounts.

In addition to greater authority from external agencies, policies internal to the University have been modified to give the campuses greater authority. For example, approval by System Administration for certain telecommunication, computer equipment, medical equipment and consulting services was necessary five years ago; campuses now have the authority to make these purchases without System Administration review. Likewise, in the area of human resources, campus presidents now have the authority to provide administrative leaves and additional sick leave to employees, which previously required the Chancellor's approval.
Work in this area is not yet done. The University intends to continue to seek less restrictive limits on the competitive bidding process and on pre-approvals for contracts. Greater authority for the campuses to classify positions and a streamlined process for the creation of new position titles will be pursued with the Department of Civil Service. Within the University itself, there will be continued emphasis on reducing or eliminating cumbersome approval/review processes (e.g., streamlined program review process, described under Academic Program Directions).

The University's hospitals were given additional management authority under legislation enacted in mid 1990s. That legislation sought to address operational concerns arising from the hospitals' state agency status, environmental changes in health care financing (including deregulation of the health care industry at federal and state levels) and financial difficulties related to the financing of the University's operating budget. Although the legislation provided what, at the time, was perceived as the necessary authority to address major concerns of the University's three hospitals, changing market dynamics and unexpected reductions in the funding of graduate medical education offset enacted legislative benefits.

The University's hospitals have remained hampered by their inability to access working capital and capital financing. This, in turn, has limited their ability to take advantage of new business opportunities. Over the last five to ten years, the hospitals have essentially maintained their current market share, with some slight increase in volume attributable to brand recognition.

The University's current legislative agenda seeks to broaden the existing flexibility legislation by addressing issues such as access to capital financing, establishing more realistic purchasing rules, increasing healthcare worker salaries to attract and retain skilled patient care staff, and facilitating the formation of full-service healthcare networks. More generally, the agenda seeks to enhance the ability of SUNY's hospitals to compete successfully in a rapidly changing market and to continue to provide superb patient care.
Operations – An Administrative Structure to Enhance Academic Quality

In Rethinking SUNY, the Board of Trustees called for the Chancellor and System officers to examine System Administration and to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the central office. By implementing the recommendations in that plan, the size of the support functions at the State University Plaza was reduced by almost 30 percent in the mid- to late-1990s.

As a more recent step in streamlining and improving services and performance, in 2000-01 the State University conducted (with the assistance of IBM’s Education and Consulting Services) a joint planning exercise, entitled “Realigning for Excellence,” for the three entities which make up the State University Plaza (i.e., the Research Foundation, the Construction Fund, and System Administration). Specific attention was paid to business services, human resources, facilities management, telecommunications, and information technology. The immediate challenge was to improve the inter-relationships among these three entities (while retaining their separate corporate status), thereby enhancing their joint effectiveness and improving the quality of services to campuses. A second focus of this effort has been to help all of the entities housed at State University Plaza to use technology more effectively in their operations, including the promotion of e-commerce in dealings with campuses and extra-University constituents. The fundamental thrust of the Realigning for Excellence (RFE) initiative is to add value to the University by structuring central administrative functions in ways that are more supportive of the University, especially the campuses. The University’s senior leadership plans to implement many of the RFE recommendations in the coming months, with particular attention to:

✦ Creating internal councils, organized around core administrative functions, to promote cooperation and communication within the State University Plaza; and

✦ Creating campus advisory committees to work with such internal councils to ensure productive partnerships and collaboration in the development and delivery of services.

Looking to the future, SUNY’s leadership will—with considerable campus and faculty involvement—continue its strategic planning efforts by crafting new and sharper mission and vision statements for the University and identifying specific actions which should be taken to ensure SUNY’s success. The Memoranda of Understanding that were signed with campuses as part of Mission Review will provide a campus-based and academically oriented foundation for this effort.
The State University of New York has made tremendous strides since Rethinking SUNY. As called for in that planning document and described in this Master Plan, key efficiencies have been realized and attention has been focused on achieving academic excellence. The Mission Review process represents a significant planning and evaluation effort—unparalleled in SUNY’s history and unrivaled in American higher education—that has defined the University’s academic agenda for the next four years. Memoranda of Understanding will guide planning and policy making for campuses and System alike, and will provide a mechanism for ensuring accountability in the coming years.

Service to local regions, the state, and the nation will continue to be a priority for the University. From charter schools to workforce development, from basic research to technology transfer and incubator centers, the State University is committed to using its expertise for the betterment of citizens of New York and beyond.

Management flexibility and devolution of authority has freed our campuses from some of the constraints entailed by a state bureaucracy. Along with increased autonomy, campuses have assumed greater accountability for their academic and non-academic decisions. More than ever before, goals and expectations are explicitly stated and successful performance is recognized and rewarded across the University.

At its heart, the University is fundamentally about excellence in learning and teaching. SUNY judges itself on the quality of the education that it provides to its students and on how that education transforms and empowers students’ lives. Our faculty and institutions take equally seriously their obligation to push the boundaries of knowledge and human understanding through research and scholarship. Fulfillment of academic goals is how the State University best strengthens and serves New York State.
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List of Campuses

University Centers
University at Albany
University at Binghamton
University at Buffalo
University at Stony Brook

Colleges

Comprehensive Arts & Sciences
Brockport
Buffalo
Cortland
Empire State College
Fredonia
Geneseo
New Paltz
Old Westbury
Oneonta
Oswego
Plattsburgh
Potsdam
Purchase

Specialized
Environmental Science and Forestry
Farmingdale
Institute of Technology
at Utica/Rome
Maritime
Optometry

Statutory
Ceramics at Alfred University
Agriculture/Life Sciences
at Cornell University
Human Ecology
at Cornell University
Industrial/Labor Relations
at Cornell University
Veterinary Medicine
at Cornell University

Health Science Centers
Health Science Center at Brooklyn
Health Science Center at Syracuse

Colleges of Technology
Alfred
Canton
Cobleskill
Delhi
Morrisville

Community Colleges
Adirondack
Broome
Cayuga
Clinton
Columbia-Greene
Corning
Dutchess
Erie
Fashion Institute of Technology
Finger Lakes
Fulton-Montgomery
Genesee
Herkimer County
Hudson Valley
Jamestown
Jefferson
Mohawk Valley
Monroe
Nassau
Niagara County
North Country
Onondaga
Orange County
Rockland
Schenectady County
Suffolk County
Sullivan County
Tompkins Cortland
Ulster County
Westchester

Educational Opportunity Centers
Bronx
Brooklyn
Buffalo
Capital District
Long Island
Manhattan
North Bronx Career Counseling and Outreach Center
Queens
Rochester
SUNY College and Career Counseling Center
Syracuse
Westchester
**Mission Review: Recognized by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) as a Best Practice in Higher Education**

At its November 1999 annual meeting, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) released an Action Agenda entitled, “A Commitment to Students, Community and Society.” The Action Agenda calls for public comprehensive colleges and universities to “…ensure that they remain accessible and affordable, to communicate their vision and their success, and to continue to provide higher education opportunities that will ensure an enlightened and educated citizenry…”

In conjunction with communicating this Agenda, AASCU felt it important to recognize the significant progress currently being made in these areas. The Agenda highlighted 100 examples of best practices in four areas: Quality Assurance, Public Engagement, Advocacy and Communications, and Access and Inclusion.

Responding to AASCU’s request for submissions, the University was awarded three citations for the following programs/initiatives: Mission Review (Quality Assurance), Campus-Wide Assessment and Institutional Accreditation at Fredonia (Quality Assurance), and the Center for Social Responsibility and Community at Oneonta (Public Engagement).

A) **Mission Review** – cited for its intention to position campuses to compete most successfully for students and to deliver high-quality programs; to enable SUNY institutions to leverage resources; to avoid unnecessary duplication of resources; and to achieve more consensus on the mix and level of teaching, research, and service on each campus.

B) **SUNY College at Fedonia** – cited for combining campus-wide assessment and institutional accreditation. The campus has embarked on an institutional self-study as the accreditation for the Middle States begins. A comprehensive approach to institutionalizing the assessment process will be developed and implemented.

C) **SUNY College at Oneonta** – cited for its Center for Social Responsibility and Community. The Center works to develop a strong sense of social responsibility in undergraduate students through a range of service, volunteer, and philanthropic experiences.
The SUNY Community Colleges have completed the development of this five-year Strategic Plan and submits it to its many publics herewith. This represents the first strategic plan in the history of the system of community colleges. The planning process began in 1998 when the Association of Presidents of Public Community Colleges (APPCC) and the New York Community College Trustees (NYCCT) commissioned a study on the community colleges from the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS). This study, which recommended the development of a vision and strategic plan for the system of community colleges, became an impetus for undertaking this major planning initiative.

The Strategic Plan was developed by the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges and involved the collaboration of many constituent groups, including the Chancellor and senior staff, the Advisory Committee to the Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges, the APPCC, the NYCCT, the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, and the Committee on Community Colleges of the SUNY Board of Trustees, as well as several other community college staff committees and other individuals.

This document delineates a set of activities designed to guide the growth and development of the SUNY community colleges as a system of colleges over the next five years. The development and adoption of the new Mission and Vision statements for the community colleges preceded the process of development of this plan. These statements are included here. The strategic plan outlines the primary activities that will be undertaken in the next several years to achieve the vision for the community colleges.

Implementation of the strategic plan will be a challenging yet most exciting and promising undertaking. Strategic planning is intended to competitively position the organization, and the conditions are ideal for strengthening the community colleges in higher education in New York State. It is about developing strength as a system and improving our capability to respond to state needs, demonstrating our willingness and ability to think out of the box, especially where new types of programs and delivery systems are concerned.

In many ways, we are already well positioned to achieve our vision—many of the items proposed in this plan are well underway. I was recently asked how, in addition to everything else we presently do, we would possibly mobilize and find the time and resources to implement our vision. My response is this: first, we must believe our vision is achievable, and most of us genuinely believe it is. Second, it will have commitment, participation and leadership at all levels to operationalize it—including college, system, SUNY and college trustees, state political leadership, community, and business and industry. Third, it will have considerable sustained time and effort on the part of college presidents, faculty and staff, with the support and assistance of system administration, and the resources sufficient to enable it to happen.
Our Strategic Plan is dynamic in that it will change and grow as conditions change and our experience evolves. The driving force behind the success of this plan will be the shared belief in and support for the vision. I hope this is merely the beginning of a long tradition of strategic action by the SUNY community colleges as a system.

Robert T. Brown
Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges
September 2001

The SUNY Community Colleges ensure open access to high quality postsecondary education and contribute significantly to the development of an educated citizenry and skilled workforce. They offer comprehensive learning opportunities ranging from transfer and career degrees to programs customized to serve specific individual, community, business and economic development needs. All share a dedication to instruction and services that nurtures the academic and personal achievement of individuals with diverse backgrounds and aspirations.

The SUNY Community Colleges, individually and as a system, are leaders in higher education in New York State and in the nation. They are highly effective in responding to the educational needs of all people and the local, regional, state and global communities to which they belong. Innovative and flexible learning options, strategies and technologies characterize their array of constantly evolving programs and services in general education, workforce training, community service and economic development.

✦ Achieve a greater system identity and the capability to act as an effective system, including coordinating and facilitating system-wide activities
✦ Improve local governance and state coordination roles and relationships
✦ Achieve broad-based recognition and promotion of the SUNY Community Colleges
✦ Develop the role of SUNY’s community colleges in statewide and regional workforce and economic development
✦ Ensure responsiveness to statewide needs by expanding the capabilities of a common framework for joint program development and delivery
✦ Ensure adequate resources to support the development and operation of the Community Colleges, including physical facilities and technology, in a manner consistent with the system mission and vision
✦ Develop and recognize the talent of college faculty, staff, presidents, administrators and trustees
✦ Implement and evaluate progress toward achieving the vision for the Community Colleges, and ensure overall performance effectiveness and measurable outcomes

Mission Statement

Vision Statement

Strategic Goals
GOAL 1: Achieve a greater system identity and the capability to act as an effective system, including coordinating and facilitating system-wide activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Develop understanding of &quot;system&quot;</td>
<td>a. Create working definitions of &quot;system&quot; and &quot;effective system&quot; (1) With community colleges coordinated, yet retaining local autonomy</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges (VCCC) with System Admin., Assoc. of Presidents of Public Community Colleges (APPCC), New York Community College Trustees (NYCCT), Faculty Council of Community Colleges (FCCC) and SUNY Trustees</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – Dec. 2001</td>
<td>A clear definition of system and what it means for the SUNY community colleges will be developed and adopted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Improve system coordination</td>
<td>a. Develop a system-wide planning and communications structure among the community colleges (e.g. meetings, listservs, college associations such as business officers)</td>
<td>VCCC, with APPCC, NYCCT, FCCC, inter-college associations</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – June 2002 and ongoing</td>
<td>Communications mechanisms are formalized and functional</td>
<td>$ xxxxx to support misc. meeting expenses and travel to meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Create mechanisms to improve coordination among the community colleges and between the community colleges and other SUNY sectors, including incentives and rewards for collaboration</td>
<td>VCCC and System Admin., Leadership and staff, with APPCC, other sector Presidents, FCCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – Dec. 2002 and ongoing</td>
<td>Concrete communications and decision mechanisms and processes will be devised and implemented to support system-wide activities</td>
<td>$ xxxxx pool of discretionary funds to support collaborative projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Create mechanisms to minimize competition and conflict among institutions, and within and between sectors, and to facilitate cooperation between institutions and sectors</td>
<td>VCCC and System Admin., Leadership and staff, with APPCC, other sector Presidents, FCCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – Dec. 2002 and ongoing</td>
<td>Mechanisms for facilitating inter-campus and inter-sector cooperation will be devised and implemented</td>
<td>Part of the above initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GOAL 1: Achieve a greater system identity and the capability to act as an effective system, including coordinating and facilitating system-wide activities (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Increase information capacity through a common data collection and reporting system</td>
<td>a. Develop and implement a common data collection, analysis and reporting system</td>
<td>Associate Provost for Institutional Research with VCCC, campus IR directors organization and APPCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – June 2003</td>
<td>A comprehensive and common CE database, data collection and reporting system has been designed and implemented</td>
<td>TBD as a result of detailed analysis and planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Ensure that System IR collects appropriate CE data and reports it in formats useful to the colleges</td>
<td>Associate Provost for IR with VCCC, IR directors organization and APPCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2002 – June 2003</td>
<td>Data elements to be collected and reported are agreed on and the format and content of system reports are determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Strengthen New York's Community Colleges by building the SUNY-CUNY relationship</td>
<td>a. Pursue opportunities to communicate and collaborate in areas of common interest, e.g. through strong joint involvement in APPCC, NYCT, PCCC, and joint participation in statewide staff organizations</td>
<td>VCCC with SUNY Board of Trustees Committee on Community Colleges, SUNY and CUNY community college Presidents and staff, NYCT and PCCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – June 2002 and ongoing</td>
<td>Evidence of joint participation in meetings and collective action on priority items</td>
<td>$xxxxxx for joint travel and expenses of meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Develop a common agenda for statewide community college development and promotion, funding, etc</td>
<td>VCCC with SUNY Board of Trustees Committee on Community Colleges, SUNY and CUNY community college Presidents and staff, NYCT, PCCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – Dec. 2002 and ongoing</td>
<td>Evidence of common agenda items which are successfully implemented including funded projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Institute communications and opportunities for collaboration between SUNY and CUNY boards of Trustees</td>
<td>VCCC with SUNY Board of Trustees and CUNY Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Jan. 2002 – June 2002 and ongoing</td>
<td>The SUNY and CUNY Boards of Trustees institute regular communications and host at least one joint meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GOAL 2: Improve local governance and state coordination roles and relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Improve and develop consensus and understanding of local and state governance roles and relationships</td>
<td>a. Define SUNY's and the colleges' perceptions of the way things are: (1) SUNY's coordination role in philosophical and operational terms, including the role of system staff (2) Local governance roles and responsibilities (3) Internal college governance roles and relationships b. Analyze and determine what the SUNY, local and internal governance roles should be ideally</td>
<td>VCCC with System Admin, leadership and staff, APPCC, NYCCT, PCCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – Aug. 2003</td>
<td>The roles of the respective partners are defined as currently perceived and as ideally intended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 2: Improve local governance and state coordination roles and relationships (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) Gather information to serve as the basis for developing a comprehensive policy and procedures manual for the colleges (e.g. fiscal, conflict of interest, copyright, etc.)</td>
<td>(4) Jan. 2002 – Dec. 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Increase and improve system support for community colleges</td>
<td>Chancellor and System leadership with VCCC and system functional units and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Strengthen and expand the matrix management approach and structure</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – Aug. 2002 and ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Administer a survey of the colleges to determine the specific types of services that could be effectively provided centrally and services that are amenable to inter-college cooperation. Create an action agenda.</td>
<td>The matrix structure is clearly visible and functioning well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCCC and System COO with System staff and college presidents and staff</td>
<td>Included with above item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey is administered and results tabulated and ready for use</td>
<td>$xxxxxx for survey administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding and improving the SUNY System Admin. structure and services (e.g. legal, fiscal, IT) to provide support, facilitation and technical assistance to the community colleges and to coordinate their system-wide efforts</td>
<td>Jan. 2002 – Dec. 2002 and ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Admin. services to the colleges are expanded and improved. The colleges express satisfaction with the level of support being received from System Admin.</td>
<td>$xxxxxx for additional (or earmarked) staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCCC and System COO with System Admin. leadership and staff, and Community College Presidents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Develop the system of inter-campus affiliated staff organizations (e.g. Academic VP’s, business officers, IR directors, etc.) as a basis for planning and collective action</td>
<td>The staff councils are meeting regularly are well organized and produce concrete cooperative results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCCC and System staff with college presidents and staff</td>
<td>$xxxxxx to support misc. expenses, costs of meetings and travel to meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 2: Improve local governance and state coordination roles and relationships (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Improve communications between System Admin, and the community colleges</td>
<td>a. Expand and improve SUNY System Admin, communications and relations with community college constituent groups, including greater openness, responsiveness, inclusion, consultation and mutual trust</td>
<td>Chancellor and System leadership with community college leadership</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 and ongoing</td>
<td>Extent and quality of system-campus communications are increased; SUNY and college leadership express greater trust and satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Clearly articulate overall SUNY System priorities, strategies and directions to the colleges. Recognize and include community college strategic directions as a critical element of the overall SUNY plan</td>
<td>Chancellor and SUNY Board of Trustees with System leadership and VCCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 and ongoing</td>
<td>Communication of system directions and priorities, including community colleges, has become a standard practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Develop comprehensive knowledge of community colleges across system Admin and a consistent service-oriented approach to community colleges</td>
<td>VCCC with System leadership and staff</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 and ongoing</td>
<td>Meetings and discussions designed to educate system staff about community college philosophy, operations, governance, finance, etc. are held</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Arrange open and ongoing dialogue to discuss roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>VCCC with Chancellor, SUNY Trustees, NYCCT, APPCC, PCCC, Local Sponsors</td>
<td>Sept. 2002 – Aug. 2003</td>
<td>Meetings of the various partners have been held and roles discussed, clarified and understood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GOAL 3: Achieve broad-based recognition and promotion of the SUNY Community Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Increase public visibility of the community colleges</td>
<td>a. Develop and implement a marketing plan for the system of community colleges (1) Identify markets and state plans for the system (2) Include a statewide and national advertising campaign, to include a community college website.</td>
<td>Associate Vice Chancellor for Public Relations with CC public relations officers and marketing directors, marketing consultant</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – June 2002</td>
<td>A comprehensive plan for marketing the community colleges is developed and implemented.</td>
<td>$xxxxxx for market study, plan development and website design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Project and promote an environment and reputation that attracts and retains talented leaders, faculty and staff</td>
<td>VCCC with System leadership and college leadership.</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 and ongoing</td>
<td>Recruitment processes include promotion of the community colleges and SUNY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Create a system of newspaper clips for the community colleges and distribute these across the system as well as externally</td>
<td>SUNY System PR Office with VCCC, college PR officers</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 and ongoing</td>
<td>A system for distributing news clips is implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Conduct and disseminate an economic impact study for the system of community colleges</td>
<td>VCCC with Associate Vice Chancellor for Public Relations, Associate Provost for IR, APPCC, NYCCCT</td>
<td>Jan. 2002 – Dec. 2002</td>
<td>Economic Impact Study is completed and widely disseminated</td>
<td>$xxxxxx for study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Institute a newsletter (hard copy and on-line) to promote community college best practices inside and outside the SUNY system.</td>
<td>VCCC ofC, with college liaisons</td>
<td>Sept. 2002 – June 2003 and ongoing</td>
<td>Newsletter is developed, produced and widely disseminated</td>
<td>$xxxxxx for costs of development, production and distribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GOAL 3: Achieve broad-based recognition and promotion of the SUNY Community Colleges (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.2 Increase the knowledge of state political leadership pertaining to community colleges | a. Develop and implement a legislative agenda to support the development of the SUNY community colleges and implementation of their vision and strategic plan  
1. Strengthen and coordinate the SUNY system and community college strategies for educating legislators re: the community college vision, plans, needs, priorities and accomplishments | Chancellor and SUNY Board of Trustees with VCCC, APPCC/NYCC, Legislative Committee, SUNY Office of Governmental Relations, Legislative contacts | Sept. 2001 – June 2003 and ongoing | A legislative agenda promoting the community colleges and their strategic plan is devised and implemented with state legislative leadership |  |
| | b. Educate and cultivate relationships with the Governor and Governor's Office to also educate and build greater support for the community college vision and plans | Chancellor and SUNY Board of Trustees with VCCC, SUNY Office, Governmental Relations, Governor's Office, APPCC, and NYCT | Sept. 2001 – June 2002 and ongoing | A program to promote the community colleges and their strategic plan is devised and implemented with the Governor |  |
| | c. Implement a series of meetings, dinners, forums and trips for state legislators at community colleges (e.g., dinners with presidents and other local and SUNY leaders) | Office of Government Relations with Chancellor's Office, VCCC, APPCC, NYCC, FCCT | Sept. 2002 – June 2003 and ongoing | A series of dinners for legislators are held | $xx for costs of dinners |
GOAL 4: Develop the role of SUNY's Community Colleges in statewide and regional workforce and economic development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Improve and expand the reputation and role of the community colleges in economic and workforce development</td>
<td>a. Develop the reputation of SUNY and the community colleges, among state and local economic development entities, as being a partner and a vital resource in economic development and primary provider of workforce training within the state and regionally</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Business and Industry Relations with VCCC, System staff, college presidents and other representatives, and state and local economic development reps.</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – Aug. 2003 and ongoing</td>
<td>Support for SUNY role is evidenced by extent of agency initiated contacts and resulting program opportunities</td>
<td>$ xxxxx for a matrix structure position dedicated to economic development support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Increase strategic partnerships to identify and address statewide and regional workforce development needs and opportunities</td>
<td>a. Develop strategic statewide partnerships with business, industries, business and industry associations, community organizations and government for planning, program development, resource development, promotion, and collaboration</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Business and Industry Relations with VCCC, other System staff, and campus representatives</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – Aug. 2003 and ongoing</td>
<td>Several partnerships are formed resulting in new programs and/or funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Work with local and state government agencies, and business and industry, to identify statewide and regional workforce needs and opportunities</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Business and Industry Relations with VCCC, System staff, community college presidents and staff, state agencies, Governor's office, Business Council, business associations and other organizations</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – Aug. 2003 and ongoing</td>
<td>State leadership as well as state agencies and business and industry are cognizant and supportive of the community college role as evidenced by the extent of contacts and program opportunities that result</td>
<td>Incorporated in item above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GOAL 4: Develop the role of SUNY’s Community Colleges in statewide and regional workforce and economic development (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Advocacy: Define a stronger role and agenda for community colleges to serve statewide needs</td>
<td>PCCC with System Admin, staff, State Ed. staff, APPCC, chief academic officers, FCCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2002 – Aug. 2003</td>
<td>Colleges demonstrate their joint capabilities by developing and implementing a joint program initiative</td>
<td>TBD depending on the costs of a specific model program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Education: Educate state and local government agencies about the training programs and services that community colleges offer</td>
<td>VCC with System Admin, staff, State Ed. staff, APPCC, chief academic officers, FCCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2002 – Aug. 2003</td>
<td>A SUNY presence is evident on the various agency economic development websites and in program and promotional information sources</td>
<td>$xxxx for incidental costs of advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Develop mechanisms for a rapid system-wide response to emerging needs and opportunities</td>
<td>PCCC with System Admin, staff, State Ed. staff, APPCC, chief academic officers, FCCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2002 – Aug. 2003</td>
<td>A SUNY presence is evident on the various agency economic development websites and in program and promotional information sources</td>
<td>$xxxx for incidental costs of advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Develop a SUNY and community college presence in statewide economic development promotions and web sites (e.g. Governor’s web site, hi-tech NY web site, SUNY links, ESDC info. resources, etc.)</td>
<td>PCCC with System Admin, staff, State Ed. staff, APPCC, chief academic officers, FCCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2002 – Aug. 2003</td>
<td>A SUNY presence is evident on the various agency economic development websites and in program and promotional information sources</td>
<td>$xxxx for incidental costs of advertising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Increase resources for the statewide system of economic and workforce development</td>
<td>PCCC with System Admin, staff, State Ed. staff, APPCC, chief academic officers, FCCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2002 – June 2003 and ongoing</td>
<td>Funds are continued and increased within the state budget for community colleges</td>
<td>$xxxxxxx for contract course allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 4: Develop the role of SUNY's Community Colleges in statewide and regional workforce and economic development (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Offer state budget incentives to develop high-demand yet high-cost technical skills programs, as well as state aid for non-credit industry training programs</td>
<td>Office of Gov. Relations with VCCC, APPCC, NY CCT</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – Aug. 2003</td>
<td>Funds are allocated within the state budget process</td>
<td>$ xxxxxx for technical programs</td>
<td>$ xxxxxx for non-credit FTE course aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Enhance communications and collaboration between SUNY System Admin., the colleges and state/regional/local agency economic development representatives, as well as among the network of community college workforce development staff representatives</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Business and Industry with VCCC, state agency representatives, System staff and college workforce development reps</td>
<td>Jan. 2002 – Dec. 2003 and ongoing</td>
<td>A forum and method for regular discussion and co-ordination by state and local workforce and economic development representatives is in place and working</td>
<td>$ xxxxxx to create and support networking opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Be actively involved in the implementation of the Workforce Investment Act on a statewide and local level</td>
<td>VCCC and Vice Chancellor for Business and Industry Relations with NYS Dept. of Labor, System staff, college presidents and staff</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Colleges are actively involved in WIA at the local level and are receiving funding for training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GOAL 5: Ensure responsiveness to statewide needs by expanding the capabilities of a common framework for joint program development and delivery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Improve program development and approval processes</td>
<td>a. Provide leadership in developing a simpler, expeditious, more flexible and streamlined SUNY/SED process for curriculum and program approval, including distance learning/internet-based offerings</td>
<td>Provost’s Office with VCCC, SED, APPCC, NYCT, PCCC</td>
<td>Jan, 2001 – Dec, 2001</td>
<td>A new simpler, streamlined process is implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Refine, promote and use the NYNEX model as the statewide prototype for system-wide curriculum planning and development and delivery of joint programs and facilitating cooperative regional initiatives in unique program areas</td>
<td>Provost’s Office with VCCC and campus presidents, chief academic officers, PCCC, and faculty</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – Dec. 2002 and ongoing</td>
<td>New joint programs are developed and implemented among multiple campuses</td>
<td>TBD based on the costs of specific projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Increase statewide programs and program support, and the capacity for joint effort</td>
<td>a. Develop joint statewide program offerings to address statewide needs</td>
<td>Provost’s Office with Vice Chancellor for Business and Industry Relations, VCCC, campus presidents, chief academic officers, and faculty</td>
<td>Sept. 2002 and ongoing</td>
<td>Program opportunities are identified and acted upon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Develop and implement common student recruitment practices for and promotion of unique programs with statewide potential</td>
<td>Associate Vice Chancellor for Public Relations with VCCC, Enrollment Management Office, and campus presidents, PR and admissions officers</td>
<td>Sept. 2002 – June 2003 and ongoing</td>
<td>Cooperative recruiting efforts are identified and implemented</td>
<td>$xxxx for joint recruitment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**GOAL 5: Ensure responsiveness to statewide needs by expanding the capabilities of a common framework for joint program development and delivery (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Ensure and facilitate a strong role for faculty in the development of statewide programs and curricula</td>
<td>Provost’s Office with VCCC and PCCC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Faculty are involved in all program development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Increase the efficiency and effectiveness of student transfer in SUNY</td>
<td>a. Develop a SUNY-wide policy for in-SUNY student transfer that ensures transfer opportunities for all community college graduates and automatic transferability of general education curriculum</td>
<td>Provost’s Office with VCCC and campus representatives</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – June 2002</td>
<td>SUNY transfer policies are clarified and implemented by all campuses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Institute SUNY transfer reports with indices of success for community college graduates transferring inside and outside SUNY. Educate transfer institutions about the success of community college graduates who transfer</td>
<td>Provost’s Office and SUNY IR, with community college Chief Academic Officers and IR Directors, and leadership of other institutions</td>
<td>Jan. 2002 – June 2002 and ongoing</td>
<td>Transfer reports are completed and widely disseminated</td>
<td>IR resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Develop policies and procedures that ensure the letter and spirit of the SUNY Board of Trustees resolutions addressing the transfer of community college graduates are carried out</td>
<td>Provost’s Office with Senior Vice Chancellor, Chancellor, VCCC, APCCC, NYCTT, PCCC</td>
<td>Jan. 2002 – June 2002</td>
<td>Procedures enforcing the Board resolutions are developed and implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Develop financial and other incentives for senior institutions and students that promote associate degree completion prior to transfer</td>
<td>Provost’s Office with Vice Chancellor for Finance, VCCC, APCCC</td>
<td>Jan. 2002 – Dec. 2002</td>
<td>Financial and other incentives are implemented</td>
<td>TBD based on the state op, budget planning process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 5: Ensure responsiveness to statewide needs by expanding the capabilities of a common framework for joint program development and delivery (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Monitor the SUNY campuses to ensure that MOU-established selectivity is implemented and maintained</td>
<td>Provost’s Office</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>MOU targets are enforced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Expand flexible program delivery options</td>
<td>a. Design a model for flexible program delivery (multi-campus, flexible start-up and phase-outs, flexible scheduling, multiple student and employer program options and sub-options, instructional alternatives, etc.), Include expanded use of SLN (or other on-line method) as a delivery vehicle</td>
<td>Chief academic officers with Provost’s Office support, FCCC and other system and campus representatives, including faculty and chief academic officers</td>
<td>Jan. 2002 – Dec. 2002</td>
<td>Creative options for instructional delivery are developed and implemented, including expanded SLN offerings</td>
<td>$ xxxxxx for campus-based development projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 6: Ensure adequate resources to support the development and operation of the Community Colleges, including physical facilities and technology, in a manner consistent with the system mission and vision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Ensure adequate and stable funding for community college operations and development</td>
<td>a. Develop and implement an improved funding partnership and funding formula/policy, including policies to ensure stable, predictable, adequate and equitable state aid, reasonable student tuition and local sponsor maintenance of effort. (1) Develop Operating Aid Funding Principles (2) Review the formulae of other states (3) Select best formula options and recommend the formula that will address the funding principles</td>
<td>VCCC with APPCC, System Admin, SUNY Board of Trustees, Legislators, CUNY, NYCCCT, Sponsors</td>
<td>Jan. 2001 – June 2002</td>
<td>A revised funding formula is adopted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Assure that adequate funds are budgeted to support mandated activities such as general education implementation and campus-based assessment</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Finance with VCCC, System Admin. staff, SUNY Board of Trustees, APPCC, FGCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – June 2002</td>
<td>Funds are created within the community college budget to support mandated activities</td>
<td>TBD as part of the budget planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Create a funding mechanism to support innovation, the special needs of community colleges, and the implementation of the strategic plan (such as special appropriations, system-wide fund raising) (1) Create funding in the current budget and develop guidelines for distribution</td>
<td>VCCC with Vice Chancellor for Finance, System Admin. staff, SUNY Board of Trustees, APPCC, NYCCCT, FGCC</td>
<td>Jan. 2002 – Dec. 2003</td>
<td>A fund for innovation is created in the state budget for community colleges</td>
<td>$xxxxxx annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 6: Ensure adequate resources to support the development and operation of the Community Colleges, including physical facilities and technology, in a manner consistent with the system mission and vision (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Ensure adequate capital financing for facilities and technology</td>
<td>a. Pursue adequate capital financing to support the development and maintenance of facilities and contemporary educational technologies</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Finance with VCCC, System Admin, staff, SUNY Board of Trustees, APPCC, NYCT, Business Officers, Construction Fund, local sponsors. Also create an Ad Hoc Capital Facilities Committee</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – June 2003 and ongoing</td>
<td>Mechanisms are created and put into place to generate regular and adequate capital financing.</td>
<td>TBD as part of the capital budgeting process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Examine the current funding formula (50% state, 50% county) and explore alternative funding formulas for capital facilities (e.g. 100% state financing, etc.)</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Finance with VCCC, System Admin, staff, SUNY Board of Trustees, APPCC, NYCT, Business Officers, local sponsors, and Ad Hoc Committee</td>
<td>Jan. 2002 – June 2003</td>
<td>Alternative funding formula for capital projects is adopted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Improve the community college and system master plans and planning processes</td>
<td>a. Evaluate and redesign policies and procedures for capital financing and capital construction to increase flexibility and effectiveness</td>
<td>VCCC with presidents, business officers, Construction Fund, System Admin, staff, Ad Hoc Capital Facilities Committee</td>
<td>Sept. 2002 – Aug. 2003</td>
<td>A capital facilities policies and procedures manual is produced and disseminated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Create a mechanism within System Admin. to assist with and provide technical assistance in facilities planning to the colleges</td>
<td>VCCC with System Admin. staff, Construction Fund, campus presidents and business officers</td>
<td>Sept. 2002 – Aug. 2003 and ongoing</td>
<td>A system (and perhaps a person) is put into place to provide direct technical assistance to the colleges</td>
<td>$ xx,xxx to support a matrix position in the Construction Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Develop procedures for reviewing and prioritizing capital project requests</td>
<td>VCCC with System Admin. staff, Construction Fund, campus presidents and business officers, Ad Hoc Capital Facilities Committee</td>
<td>Sept. 2002 – Aug. 2003 and ongoing</td>
<td>A set of clear review procedures is completed, disseminated and implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 6: Ensure adequate resources to support the development and operation of the Community Colleges, including physical facilities and technology, in a manner consistent with the system mission and vision (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Summarize and aggregate the campus capital facilities Master Plans into an overall Master Plan for the system of colleges</td>
<td>VCCC with System Admin, staff, Construction Fund, campus presidents, and business officers</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – Dec. 2002 and ongoing</td>
<td>A system-wide capital facilities Master Plan is completed and utilized in the planning and budgeting processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Each community college will develop a Master Plan for Technology. The capital components of these master plans will be integrated within the capital facilities master plan for each college and for the system</td>
<td>VCCC with System IT and Construction Fund staff, campus presidents, business officers, and IT directors</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – Dec. 2002</td>
<td>Campus-specific and system-wide capital facilities Master Plans are completed and utilized in the planning and budgeting processes</td>
<td>TBD as part of the budget planning process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Expand the System Admin. role in providing technical support and guidance to community college technology efforts and systems</td>
<td>System Admin, IT Director with Dir. OFR, VCCC campus presidents, business officers and campus IT and IR directors</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – Aug. 2002 and ongoing</td>
<td>A system (and perhaps a person) is put into place to provide direct technical assistance to the colleges and to serve as liaison</td>
<td>$ xxxxx to support a matrix position in IT and IR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Promote the process of engaging system buying power in the execution of contracts for software and hardware</td>
<td>VCCC with System Admin, IT Director and business of representative, campus presidents, business officers and IT directors</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – Aug. 2003</td>
<td>If feasible, a process for joint purchasing of hardware and software is implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Explore the feasibility of utilizing common administrative hardware and software systems</td>
<td>System Admin, IT Director with Dir. of IR, VCCC, campus presidents, business officers and campus IT and IR directors</td>
<td>Sept. 2002 – Aug. 2003</td>
<td>A plan is completed for common data and administrative systems for the colleges</td>
<td>TBD as part of the technology planning process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GOAL 7: Develop and recognize the talent of college faculty, staff, presidents, administrators and trustees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Develop and improve leadership across the system</td>
<td>a. Create conditions and strategies to nurture effectiveness, stability, and continuity in leadership at the colleges, across the system of colleges, and at system administration</td>
<td>Chancellor with System Admin, leadership and staff, APPCC, NYCC, FCCC and college staff, and Institute for Community College Development at Cornell</td>
<td>Sept., 2001 – June 2003 and ongoing</td>
<td>Strategies and programs are in place to support leadership development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Plan, implement and fund system-wide programs of professional development for faculty, staff, administrators, and community college trustees</td>
<td>Institute for Community College Development at Cornell with VCCC and APPCC, NYCC, FCCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – June 2004</td>
<td>A series of professional development programs is implemented</td>
<td>$xxxxxx for three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Plan, implement and fund orientation programs for community college trustees</td>
<td>NYCCT, with VCCC, System Admin, staff, APPCC, and ICCD of Cornell</td>
<td>Jan. 2002 – Dec. 2002 and ongoing</td>
<td>Orientation programs for new presidents and community college trustees are implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Plan, implement and fund leadership development programs for college presidents and senior administrators including orientation and mentoring programs for new and interim presidents</td>
<td>VCCC with System Admin staff, APPCC, ICCD of Cornell</td>
<td>Jan. 2002 – Dec. 2002 and ongoing</td>
<td>Orientation, mentoring and leadership development programs are implemented for new and interim presidents</td>
<td>$xxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Clarify the SUNY role in the selection of presidents and examine the creation of an equitable system for presidential compensation</td>
<td>Chancellor’s Office with VCCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2002 – June 2003</td>
<td>Guidelines for presidential recruitment and selection are updated, the SUNY role clarified and an equitable pay system adopted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOAL 7: Develop and recognize the talent of college faculty, staff, presidents, administrators and trustees (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7.2 Develop, support and improve teaching and learning | a. Create conditions and strategies that nurture consistent high quality teaching and learning  
   (1) Implement policies that recognize and reward scholarship that results in improved teaching and learning | PCCC with VCCC, APPCC, faculty, chief academic officers and ICCD of Cornell | Sept. 2001 – Aug. 2003 and ongoing | A program of professional and instructional development and scholarship is implemented | $xxxx for two years and ongoing |
| 7.3 Increase recognition of best practices | a. Institute program and awards to identify and recognize best practices by institutions, departments and individuals, in teaching, scholarship, service, administration, programs, services and institutional performance | Chancellor’s Office with Provost’s Office, VCCC, APPCC, NYCTT, PCCC, campus representatives | Sept. 2002 – June 2003 and ongoing | A best practices identification and awards system is put into place | $xxxx for 10 monetary awards |
| | b. Create a database and collection of papers on SUNY community college best practices. Disseminate info on best practices, inside and outside the system. | VCCC with System Admin. staff, APPCC, NYCTT, PCCC, campus staff, and ICCD of Cornell | Sept. 2002 – June 2003 and ongoing | A database and series of papers on best practices are established and utilized | $xxxx for development |
**GOAL 8: Implement and evaluate progress toward achieving the vision for the Community Colleges, and ensure overall performance effectiveness and measurable outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategies / Tasks</th>
<th>Party Responsible with Stakeholders Involved</th>
<th>Timeframe / Completion</th>
<th>Planned Outcomes</th>
<th>Resources Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Ensure progress in implementing the Strategic Plan</td>
<td>a. Ensure the adoption, wide dissemination, and implementation of the Strategic Plan for the SUNY Community Colleges</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges (VCCC) with System Admin, staff, Board of Trustees Committee on Community Colleges, VCCC Advisory Committee and APPCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 and ongoing</td>
<td>High priority plan items are implemented</td>
<td>$xxxxx VCCC discretionary fund to support plan implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Develop a plan and strategies to coordinate, monitor and evaluate progress in implementing the vision and strategic plan</td>
<td>VCCC Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 and ongoing</td>
<td>Plan progress is regularly monitored and reported and progress is clearly evident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Ensure program effectiveness, improvement and innovation</td>
<td>a. Fully support campus-based assessment processes and resulting campus innovations. Improve instruction by encouraging and supporting campus educational initiatives.</td>
<td>Provost’s Office with other system offices and campus representatives, including faculty and chief academic officers</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Assessment systems are fully developed and implemented. Programs of curriculum and instructional development are commonplace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Ensure that community college performance indicators are feasible, reliable and valid and reflect the best of features</td>
<td>a. Develop a set of reasonable, goal-oriented performance indicators that can assist the colleges in assessing outcomes and effectiveness, are supported by a common database, and are for the purpose of institutional improvement</td>
<td>VCCC and System Admin, with APPCC</td>
<td>Sept. 2001 – June 2002</td>
<td>A set of performance indicators is agreed upon and implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Where accountability may be incorporated into State and System financing, planning and policy making for community colleges, advocate for accountability measures that recognize unique community college missions, successes and achievement of state goals and priorities</td>
<td>SUNY Trustees and System Admin, with VCCC, APPCC</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Performance measures utilized are reasonable, realistic and achievable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Fall 1999, the Provost established an Advisory Task Force on the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes as a committee broadly representative of the SUNY community. Membership included faculty, campus academic leadership and professional staff, students, and System Administration staff. The Task Force was charged with the responsibility to:

- Examine and discuss the issues involved in implementing undergraduate student learning outcomes assessment today—specifically, in the context of a large and diverse university system such as the State University of New York, and to make recommendations regarding:

- A process for assessing student learning outcomes and intellectual growth in General Education and the Major that will provide the faculty and academic leadership with an important and effective way of improving the quality of undergraduate education, and the University with a coherent and meaningful longitudinal data base with which to be accountable to its stakeholders.

The Task Force began its work on the SUNY Assessment Initiative in November with a general discussion about the many practical and philosophical issues involved in outcomes assessment, particularly as it affects the State University. Subsequently, it formed a number of working groups to study the issues in greater detail. At every step, the Task Force has endeavored to keep the University community informed, by publishing summaries of its meetings, meeting with groups such as the University Faculty Senate, the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, academic vice presidents, vice presidents for student affairs, and the Provost’s Advisory Council on General Education, and sharing its Interim Report with campus presidents and campus communities. It has been the Task Force’s goal to maintain a very transparent and collegial process so as to be able to develop recommendations that will find broad support across the State University.

The Task Force believes that assessment serves two complementary functions in higher education today: “Assessment as improvement” and “Assessment as accountability,” and that both of these functions have an appropriate place in the SUNY Assessment Initiative and can strengthen the University’s institutions and the system as a whole.

**Assessment as Improvement**

The SUNY Assessment Initiative places foremost emphasis on assessment as a means of improving student learning. Outcomes assessment is based upon the belief that improvement in practices is a healthy aspect of institutional life. A number of colleges and universities across the nation have acted systematically on this belief and, in the process, enhanced their programs, student learning outcomes, and their academic reputation. Assessment of student outcomes is
also in the best interests of faculty, who have a great stake in knowing whether or not their teaching efforts are effective in promoting student learning. There is a growing literature on the advantages of the assessment process in facilitating communication among faculty and providing them an opportunity to collaborate regarding the intended outcomes of their curricular programs.

**Assessment as Accountability**

As a publicly supported institution, SUNY has a responsibility to demonstrate to its stakeholders that it is fulfilling its mission. These stakeholders include: The Board of Trustees, College Council members and the Boards of Trustees of Community Colleges, executive and legislative officials, students and their parents, the public, employers and the communities served by campuses, and accrediting and regulatory bodies.

The Task Force’s recognition of these two functions of assessment is directly reflected in the following recommendations:

✦ The SUNY Assessment Initiative should place foremost emphasis on assessment as a means of improving academic programs, pedagogy, and student learning.
✦ The SUNY Assessment Initiative should consist of both campus-based and University-wide strategies, with campus-based assessment focused primarily on program improvement and University-wide assessment used primarily to serve accountability and advocacy functions.

The State University, largest in the nation, is also one of the most diverse, consisting of 64 campuses that have unique missions and which have operated effectively over the years according to their own governance and curriculum processes. Just as campuses have been allowed to implement the SUNY General Education requirement in ways that are consistent with their own structures and procedures, so must they be given flexibility to assess their programs “in accord with their own characteristics.” The Task Force therefore recommends:

✦ The SUNY Assessment Initiative must respect the diversity that exists among SUNY institutions, especially their unique missions.
✦ All activities carried out as a part of the SUNY Assessment Initiative should incorporate and respect existing governance and curriculum structures and processes.

Individual campuses and programs cannot be expected to implement comprehensive and effective campus-based assessment of General Education and the Major without new funding set aside for that purpose. A paramount responsibility for System Administration is to work assiduously with the campuses and the Trustees to guarantee that assessment efforts receive adequate resources, staff assistance, and funding on a sustained basis. Further, the SUNY Assessment Initiative provides System Administration with an invaluable opportunity to use
assessment information to inform the teaching and learning process, highlighting the various campus-based assessment approaches so that communication across campuses is enhanced and faculty from different institutions can learn from each other. The Task Force therefore recommends:

✦ SUNY System Administration should make a commitment to providing adequate resources on a sustained basis so that campuses are able to develop and implement effective modes of assessment of student learning outcomes.
✦ Individual campuses should support assessment efforts by making assessment-related funding needs a priority in their budgets.
✦ SUNY System Administration should assume responsibility for coordinating and facilitating assessment efforts across the 64 campuses and should provide multiple forums for the purpose of highlighting and publicizing best assessment practices.
✦ SUNY System Administration should commit itself to the provision of databases that are reliable, coordinated, and available to appropriate persons.

Each campus is responsible for determining the particular structure and content of its campus-based General Education assessment plan, following existing governance and curriculum processes. Similarly, individual campuses should have autonomy in determining how to disseminate the results of their campus-based General Education assessment program to their own communities. Some external review of assessment plans is desirable, preferably by faculty, administrators, and System Administration representatives who have a good working knowledge of assessment. It is also desirable that there be some uniformity among campuses in the format of the assessment plans as well as in the reporting of assessment results. Toward these ends, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

✦ Campus-based assessment plans of General Education should be developed and implemented primarily by faculty members who teach in the program, with the assistance of professional staff and students when appropriate, and submitted to and approved by the campus’s Faculty Senate or Council.
✦ Campus General Education assessment plans should be approved and reviewed regularly by a group consisting of University faculty, campus chief academic officers, and representatives from System Administration. This General Education Assessment Review (GEAR) group should be formed jointly by University Faculty Senate and Community College Faculty Council leadership and System Administration, and should include individuals who are knowledgeable about assessment.
✦ Campuses should use a standardized format, developed jointly by the campuses and System Administration, in reporting the results of their General Education assessment program to System Administration. Reported results should indicate the percentage of students exceeding, meeting, approaching, and not meeting the delineated learning outcomes.

Campus-Based Assessment of General Education
UNY University-wide assessment is governed by the assumption that academic assessment is primarily a campus-based responsibility of the faculty as they conduct the educational programs of their institutions and participate significantly in the initiation, development and implementation of those educational programs. Although campus-based assessment should be the focus of the SUNY Assessment Initiative, the Task Force believes that there is an appropriate place for University-wide assessment as well. Information derived from University-wide assessment will be used primarily by System Administration for accountability purposes—enabling it to report on the status of General Education outcomes in SUNY as a whole—and to advocate on behalf of the University. The Task Force specifically recommends:

✦ University-wide assessment should periodically assess, using common measures, a representative sample of students from across SUNY in order to gauge students' attainment in the learning outcomes of the Implementation Guidelines in Mathematics, Basic Communication, Critical Thinking (Reasoning), Information Management, and the understanding of the methods scientists and social scientists use to explore phenomena.

✦ A University-wide Assessment Implementation Working Group, comprised of faculty and students from across SUNY, with representatives from System Administration, should be formed to develop the actual assessment instrument(s) to be used, as well as the procedures to be followed.

✦ University-wide assessment should utilize a variety of evaluation approaches, all of which are demonstrated to be valid and reliable.

✦ Campuses should have sufficient time to develop and implement their own assessment programs before implementation of University-wide assessment proceeds.

Each campus is responsible for overseeing the process through which the assessment of academic major programs takes place, following existing curriculum and governance procedures. It is desirable that individual campuses establish a uniform format for programs to follow in developing their assessment plans, that program assessment take place on a regular basis, and that there be external review of programs when practicable. The Task Force does not recommend University-wide assessment of academic majors. Instead, the role of System Administration should focus on revising extant program review policies and on monitoring the frequency with which program review takes place across the University. Toward these ends, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

✦ Campuses and programs should have maximum autonomy in the development of assessment plans for academic majors, and should include the input of faculty, professional staff, and students.

✦ Assessment of academic programs should take place every five to seven years, should incorporate external review whenever feasible, and should include delineation of the programmatic goals and objectives for the major with an
emphasis on the programmatic activities that are intended to accomplish these goals and objectives and the learning outcomes students should demonstrate as they progress through the program to completion, as well as a strategy for measuring change in students’ knowledge and skills over time.

✦ Academic programs should use a standardized format and consistent procedures developed by their campus in developing and implementing their assessment plans, although latitude should be granted for programs also undergoing accreditation or certification.

✦ Each year institutions should submit a report to System Administration providing a summary of the academic programs that underwent review during that year and the major findings, as well as a listing of programs scheduled for review during the next academic year.

✦ Recommendations for assessing student learning outcomes in the Major should be carried out within the broader framework of the University Faculty Senate’s Guide for the Evaluation of Undergraduate Academic Programs.

✦ System Administration should renew its efforts to track campus-based assessment and program review efforts.

Assessment is not evaluation, nor is it competition. Assessment is a process, first and foremost, for understanding and improving student learning. Further, a true “culture of assessment” requires that assessment results—for campus-based assessment of General Education and the Major, and for University-wide assessment—be shared only with appropriate stakeholders. The Task Force therefore makes the following recommendations with respect to the utilization and reporting of assessment data gathered as part of the SUNY Assessment Initiative:

✦ System Administration should only report data gathered through University-wide assessment for accountability purposes after adequate reliability and validity estimates of the measures being used are demonstrated.

✦ Stringent guidelines should be developed and adhered to in order to ensure that confidentiality of assessment data is maintained.

✦ Assessment results should never be used to punish, publicly compare, or embarrass students, faculty, courses, programs, departments, or institutions either individually or collectively, or to make public comparisons among groups of students based on gender, race, ethnicity, or other demographic factors.

✦ System Administration should publicly disseminate assessment data only through aggregate reporting for SUNY as a whole, or by sector.

✦ While individual programs are free to use their own assessment results in ways they see fit, individual campuses should publicly disseminate assessment data only through aggregate reporting for the institution as a whole, or by school or college.
Just as System Administration and individual campuses must provide adequate support for the actual implementation of effective assessment, they must also convey to faculty and staff across the State University that participation in assessment is worthy of recognition and reward. In this way, assessment is acknowledged as a valuable—and valued—activity. The Task Force therefore recommends:

✦ System Administration should support State-operated/funded institutions with resources for campus-based assessment through Performance Funding, based upon a determination of the extent to which campuses have implemented their assessment plans for General Education and the Major. An alternative incentive process will need to be established for community colleges.

✦ Individual campuses should reward academic programs for assessment activities through their budgeting process to the greatest extent possible and recognize the assessment-related efforts of faculty and professional staff through appropriate personnel processes and incentives.

November 28, 2000
## New Programs of Study Tentatively Planned for Introduction 2000–2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany/Law School</td>
<td>Urban &amp; Regional Planning/Law</td>
<td>M.R.P./J.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany/Law School</td>
<td>Social Work/Law</td>
<td>M.S.W./J.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>B.S. /M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>B.A. /M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biomedical Anthropology</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Engineering/Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>B.S. /M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science/Information Science</td>
<td>B.S. /M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>B.S. /M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy, Politics &amp; Law/Philosophy (SPEL)</td>
<td>B.A. /M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo (Center)</td>
<td>Acute Care Nurse Practitioner</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aerospace Engineering/Business Administration</td>
<td>B.S. /M.B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemical Engineering/Business Administration</td>
<td>B.S. /M.B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computational Physics/Physics</td>
<td>B.S. /M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>B.S. /M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
<td>B.S. /M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exercise Science/Nutrition</td>
<td>B.S. /M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geriatric Nurse Practitioner</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial Engineering/Business Administration</td>
<td>B.S. /M.B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Social Sciences/Social Work</td>
<td>B.A. /M.S.W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management Information Systems</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing &amp; Operations Management</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering/Business Administration</td>
<td>B.S. /M.B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media Arts Production</td>
<td>M.F.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>D.P.T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>M.P.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Brook</td>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biochemistry/Chemistry</td>
<td>B.S. /M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
<td>B.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>B.S. /M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering Chemistry/Chemistry</td>
<td>B.S. /M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Sciences/Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>B.S. /M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td>D.P.T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science/Public Policy</td>
<td>B.A. /M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Brook/Farmingdale</td>
<td>Applied Mathematics</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applied Mathematics</td>
<td>B.S. /M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPUS</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>AWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockport</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo College</td>
<td>Applied Economics</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>Mus.B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortland</td>
<td>Childhood Education</td>
<td>M.S.T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Musical Theater</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Writing</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Language Education</td>
<td>M.S.Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>M.S.Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education - Childhood/Childhood Education</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredonia</td>
<td>Business Administration: Finance</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Administration: Management</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Administration: Management Information Systems</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Administration: Marketing</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication: Audio/Radio Production</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication: Communication Studies</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication: Media Management</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication: Public Relations</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication: TV/Digital Film Production</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>B.S.Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Childhood Specialist: Mathematics</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Arts: Art History</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Arts: Ceramics</td>
<td>B.F.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Arts: Ceramics</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Arts: Drawing</td>
<td>B.F.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Arts: Drawing</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Arts: Graphic Design</td>
<td>B.F.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Arts: Graphic Design</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Arts: Illustration</td>
<td>B.F.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Arts: Illustration</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Arts: Painting</td>
<td>B.F.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Arts: Photography</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Arts: Photography</td>
<td>B.F.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Arts: Sculpture</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual Arts: Sculpture</td>
<td>B.F.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneseo</td>
<td>Musical Theater</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oswego</td>
<td>Accounting/Public Accounting</td>
<td>B.S./M.B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global &amp; International Studies</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Accounting</td>
<td>M.B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plattsburgh</td>
<td>Communication Disorders &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women's Studies</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potsdam</td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Arts Management</td>
<td>B.F.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cinema Studies</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn HSC</td>
<td>Molecular &amp; Cell Biology</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Health</td>
<td>M.P.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse HSC</td>
<td>Medical-Surgical Clinical Specialist</td>
<td>Adv. Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing Education</td>
<td>Adv. Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPUS</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>AWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmingdale</td>
<td>Architectural Technology</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Programming &amp; Information Systems</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dental Hygiene</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management of Technology</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime</td>
<td>International Transportation &amp; Trade</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marine Environmental Science</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramics</td>
<td>Biomedical Materials Engineering Science</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp;</td>
<td>Atmospheric Sciences</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>Crop &amp; Soil Sciences</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ecology</td>
<td>Human Biology, Health &amp; Society</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>Computer Technology</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Technology</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology Management</td>
<td>B.B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veterinary Science Technology</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>Technology Management</td>
<td>B.B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobleskill</td>
<td>Geographic Information Systems Technology</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology Management</td>
<td>B.B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>Heating, Ventilating &amp; Air Conditioning Technology</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Education Studies</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology Management</td>
<td>B.B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrisville</td>
<td>Massage Therapy</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology Management</td>
<td>B.B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adirondack (ACC)</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precision Machining</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC/Glens Falls Hospital</td>
<td>Radiologic Technology</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broome</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phlebotomy</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayuga</td>
<td>Computer Hardware/Software Design</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Hardware/Software Design</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Support</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web Page Design</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia-Greene</td>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corning</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Interpreting</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutchess</td>
<td>Advanced Science &amp; Mathematics Studies</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exercise Science &amp; Wellness</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie-City</td>
<td>Geographic Information Systems</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie-North</td>
<td>Geographic Information Systems</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie-South</td>
<td>Geographic Information Systems</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIT</td>
<td>Cosmetics &amp; Fragrance Marketing &amp; Management</td>
<td>M.P.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger Lakes</td>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPUS</td>
<td>PROGRAM NAME</td>
<td>AWARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton-Montgomery</td>
<td>Legal Office Clerk</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Receptionian</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Transcriptionian</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spatial Information Technology</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spatial Information Technology</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesee</td>
<td>Computer Repair</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Database Support</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End User Support</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Science: Sport Management Studies</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Musical Theatre</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Assistant</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web Development</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herkimer</td>
<td>Computer Information Systems:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic Commerce for Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson Valley</td>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dental Assisting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Medical Technician: Paramedic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown-Main</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>A.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Studies</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network Administration</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network Hardware</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network Programming</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Piloting</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Webmaster</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamestown-Cattaraugus</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Studies</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network Administration</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network Hardware</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network Programming</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Studies</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Webmaster</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Technician: Intermediate</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emergency Medical Technician: Paramedic</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Networking Technology</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk Valley-Utica</td>
<td>Clinical Allied Health Care</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNC Machinist</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Service Technician: Fiber Optics</td>
<td>A.O.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Studies: Allied Health</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Studies: Business &amp; Industry</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Assisting</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Pilot</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Pilot</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Pilot</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web Site Design &amp; Management</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk Valley-Rome</td>
<td>Web Site Design &amp; Management</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Services/Paramedic</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS</th>
<th>PROGRAM NAME</th>
<th>AWARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monroe-Brighton</td>
<td>Massage Therapy</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telecommunications Services Technology</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe-Damon City</td>
<td>Court Reporting</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>Culinary Arts</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital Media</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital Media</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Service</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>A.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onondaga</td>
<td>Environmental Technology: Biology</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Technology: Chemistry</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Technology: Emissions Monitoring &amp; Testing</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Technology: Geoscience</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Transcription</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockland</td>
<td>Medical Transcription</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk-Ammerman</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk-Ammerman/</td>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences: Education/Child Study</td>
<td>A.A./B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph’s College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk-Eastern</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Communication</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk-Eastern/</td>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences: Education/Child Study</td>
<td>A.A./B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph’s College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk-Western</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk-Western/</td>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Science: Education/Child Study</td>
<td>A.A./B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph’s College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan</td>
<td>Commercial Art</td>
<td>A.O.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culinary Arts</td>
<td>A.O.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic/Electrical Engineering Technology</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legal Studies</td>
<td>A.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office Applications</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>A.O.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel &amp; Tourism</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Webmaster</td>
<td>A.O.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tompkins Cortland</td>
<td>Aviation Science</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Forensics</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sport Management</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulster</td>
<td>Computer Music</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electronic Commerce</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network Administrator</td>
<td>A.A.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sign Language Interpreting</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulster/Marist</td>
<td>Individual Studies/Paralegal</td>
<td>A.S./Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester</td>
<td>Computer Applications Specialist</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Help Desk Support</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web Development for E-Commerce</td>
<td>Cert.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Master Plan Amendments 1996–2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS</th>
<th>PROGRAM NAME</th>
<th>AWARD</th>
<th>DATE APPROVED BY BOARD OF TRUSTEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University at Binghamton</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>12/15/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo College</td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>4/30/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Technology at Farmingdale</td>
<td>Computer Programming &amp; Information Systems</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>5/22/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Technology at Farmingdale</td>
<td>Dental Hygiene</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>11/14/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleges of Technology at Alfred/Canton/Cobleskill/Delhi/Morrisville</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>B.Tech.</td>
<td>1/26/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Technology at Canton</td>
<td>Health Services Management</td>
<td>B.Tech.</td>
<td>11/16/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Technology at Canton</td>
<td>Public Safety Technology: Criminal Investigation</td>
<td>B.Tech.</td>
<td>6/24/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Technology at Delhi</td>
<td>Hospitality Management</td>
<td>B.B.A.</td>
<td>4/21/97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adirondack Community College</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>9/26/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Community College</td>
<td>Computer Information Systems</td>
<td>A.A.S</td>
<td>9/26/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia-Greene Community College</td>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>9/26/00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corning Community College</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>4/30/01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: January 3, 2001

From: Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Subject: 2001 Guidelines for the Submission of Undergraduate Academic Program Proposals

To: Presidents, State University of New York

Effective February 1, 2001, the attached 2001 Guidelines for the Submission of Undergraduate Academic Program Proposals will apply to all State University campuses for proposed new programs at all undergraduate award levels. These revised Guidelines supercede the Guidelines issued as Memorandum to Presidents, Vol. 96 No.1. Program Announcements and Program Proposals begun under the 1996 procedures remain governed by that process.

The 2001 Guidelines are a result of the State University’s Mission Review process in that they recognize campus mission, academic planning, quality enhancement and continuous assessment, as well as the need for System to facilitate campus introduction of new academic programs.

Noteworthy features of the 2001 Guidelines include:

✦ the establishment of clear criteria for the expedited review for all programs;
✦ implementation of an internal process for streamlining the Program Proposal review process, including reducing the number of possible review decisions from seven to three;
✦ consistency with current efforts at the State Education Department to streamline its process for program registration. A thoughtful preparation of materials under the 2001 Guidelines will meet SED’s revised requirements;
✦ the resolution of questions related to the mission appropriateness at the Program Announcement stage, as well as the use of e-mail for the announcement, with System Administration responsible for its electronic distribution;
✦ simplification of the Program Proposal form with tables for curriculum, faculty, and resources;
the requirement for external review for all new baccalaureate programs, with
the possibility of a waiver for campuses with highly developed campus faculty
governance and program resources already in place;

✦ the establishment of an electronic address for the Program Review and Planning
Group (program.review@sysadm.suny.edu) to improve communication, and
the regular (weekly and monthly) sharing of program announcements, news,
updates, information, and decisions through e-mail broadcasts and by posts
on the Office of the Provost webpage (www.sysadm.suny.edu/provost/
programreview/); and

✦ a comprehensive handbook, with guidance to campuses on the various forms
and compliance with SED regulations.

Greater accountability of the Program Review and Planning Group to campuses is
assured by the establishment of clear goals for the timely completion of its work,
including:

✦ the study of Program Announcements within 30 days of the date when the
announcement is received; and

✦ the review of complete Program Proposals that qualify for fast-track review
within 30 days of the date when the proposal is received, and complete,
non-expedited, proposals within 60 days.

Our efforts this past year to refine the process have been grounded by the good
counsel of an advisory committee of State University academic officers and our
colleagues in the State Education Department's Division of College and University
Evaluation, to whom I am grateful.

If there are any questions about this document or process, please don't hesitate to
contact me or Dr. Donald Steven, Associate Provost, Office of Academic Affairs, at
(518) 443-5663 or stevendo@sysadm.edu.

Peter D. Salins
Provost

Enclosures

This memorandum addressed to:
  Presidents, State-operated Campuses
  Presidents, Community Colleges
  Deans, Statutory Colleges

Copies for information only to:
  President Edmondson
  Provost Martin
The State University of New York Board of Trustees, in December 1998, adopted Resolution 98-241 establishing a General Education Requirement for all baccalaureate degree candidates at the University’s state-operated campuses. Both in conjunction with the Trustees’ action and in response to requests from the Chancellor and senior campus leadership, Provost Peter D. Salins appointed The Provost’s Advisory Task Force on General Education. Specifically structured to provide broad system representation, the Task Force includes campus presidents, chief academic officers, faculty and students, and is drawn from all sectors of the system.

The charge of the Task Force focused primarily on four areas. Its responsibility was to:

✦ consult with the campuses to identify their concerns in the implementation of the Trustees’ Resolution;
✦ interpret both the letter and the spirit of the Trustees’ Resolution;
✦ develop guidelines to assist campuses as they adapt their General Education programs to the Trustees’ resolution in ways consistent with campus and program missions; and
✦ identify resources that will be needed to implement the Trustees’ resolution and suggest ways that these may be developed and allocated.

In carrying out its charge, the Task Force divided into four work groups, each addressing a specific aspect of implementation. These four subcommittees were: the Academic Subject Areas Subcommittee, charged with describing the learning outcomes required by General Education programs; the Instructional Modalities Subcommittee, charged with exploring and recommending methods for producing the desired learning outcomes; the Two-year College/Transfer Issue Subcommittee, charged with analyzing and making recommendations regarding the impact of the General Education policy at two-year institutions; and the Resource Allocation Subcommittee, charged with examining and making recommendations regarding the financial implications of the new General Education policy. The Task Force developed its guidelines within the context of the State University of New York’s distinctiveness as a large system of diverse institutions, each with its own mission, goals, and needs. Efforts were made to allow campuses the flexibility to implement the policy in accord with their own unique characteristics. In this regard, curricular content is described in terms of learning outcomes, consistent with recommendations of the University Faculty Senate and the Faculty Council of Community Colleges.
Joint Task Force on General Education and with Provost Peter D. Salins' report on General Education.

In developing these guidelines, the Task Force recognizes the significance of other factors, such as assessment and budget allocations, that may have an impact on General Education policy implementation. Consequently, these guidelines would complement rather than supersede the recommendations of the Provost’s Task Force on Learning Outcomes, the principles governing the Budget Allocation Process, or individual campuses’ Mission Review Memoranda of Understanding. Consistent with the Board of Trustees’ resolution, the Task Force guidelines recognize other extant and unique circumstances that might justify waivers from, or deferment of, specific aspects of implementation.

The Task Force believes that in delineating learning outcomes and in setting a framework for implementation of recommendations, it is being faithful to the intent of the Board of Trustees’ resolution and sensitive to campus circumstances. Moreover, this General Education initiative is a work in progress and will require continuous review of both curricular content and assessment methods to ensure that it is fully and effectively implemented.

The Interpretive Guidelines component of the Task Force’s report summarizes the findings and recommendations of the Academic Subjects and Instructional Modalities Subcommittees. This section delineates the learning outcomes required by the General Education program and presents a set of precepts to guide campuses in implementing their programs.

The State University of New York’s General Education Requirement applies to all state-operated institutions offering undergraduate degrees. It requires baccalaureate degree candidates, as a condition of graduation, to complete a General Education program of no fewer than 30 credit hours specifically designed to achieve the student learning outcomes in ten knowledge and skill areas and two competencies, as specified below:

I. Learning Outcomes

   KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL AREAS

   1. Mathematics
      Students will show competence in the following quantitative reasoning skills:
         ✦ arithmetic;
         ✦ algebra;
         ✦ geometry;
         ✦ data analysis; and
         ✦ quantitative reasoning.

---

3 Final Report of State University of New York University Faculty Senate and Faculty Council of Community Colleges Joint Task Force on General Education (January, 1998).
4 General Education: Overview and Recommendations (Fall, 1998).
2. **Natural Sciences**  
Students will demonstrate:  
✦ understanding of the methods scientists use to explore natural phenomena, including observation, hypothesis development, measurement and data collection, experimentation, evaluation of evidence, and employment of mathematical analysis; and  
✦ application of scientific data, concepts, and models in one of the natural sciences.

3. **Social Sciences**  
Students will demonstrate:  
✦ understanding of the methods social scientists use to explore social phenomena, including observation, hypothesis development, measurement and data collection, experimentation, evaluation of evidence, and employment of mathematical and interpretive analysis; and  
✦ knowledge of major concepts, models and issues of at least one discipline in the social sciences.

4. **American History**  
Students will demonstrate:  
✦ knowledge of a basic narrative of American history: political, economic, social, and cultural, including knowledge of unity and diversity in American society;  
✦ knowledge of common institutions in American society and how they have affected different groups; and  
✦ understanding of America's evolving relationship with the rest of the world.

5. **Western Civilization**  
Students will:  
✦ demonstrate knowledge of the development of the distinctive features of the history, institutions, economy, society, culture, etc., of Western civilization; and  
✦ relate the development of Western civilization to that of other regions of the world.

6. **Other World Civilizations**  
Students will demonstrate:  
✦ knowledge of either a broad outline of world history, or  
✦ the distinctive features of the history, institutions, economy, society, culture, etc., of one non-Western civilization.

7. **Humanities**  
Students will demonstrate:  
✦ knowledge of the conventions and methods of at least one of the humanities in addition to those encompassed by other knowledge areas required by the General Education program.

8. **The Arts**  
Students will demonstrate:  
✦ understanding of at least one principal form of artistic expression and the creative process inherent therein.
9. **Foreign Language**
Students will demonstrate:
✦ basic proficiency in the understanding and use of a foreign language; and
✦ knowledge of the distinctive features of culture(s) associated with the language they are studying.

10. **BASIC COMMUNICATION**
Students will:
✦ produce coherent texts within common college-level written forms;
✦ demonstrate the ability to revise and improve such texts;
✦ research a topic, develop an argument, and organize supporting details;
✦ develop proficiency in oral discourse; and
✦ evaluate an oral presentation according to established criteria.

**COMPETENCIES**
The following two competencies should be infused throughout the General Education program:

1. **Critical Thinking (Reasoning)**
Students will:
✦ identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments as they occur in their own or others’ work; and
✦ develop well-reasoned arguments.

2. **Information Management**
Students will:
✦ perform the basic operations of personal computer use;
✦ understand and use basic research techniques; and
✦ locate, evaluate and synthesize information from a variety of sources.

**II. Precepts for Implementation**
As campuses develop or modify their General Education programs for implementation, they should be guided by the following precepts:

✦ Campuses shall demonstrate commitment to General Education in the following ways:
   ✦ encourage the assignment of excellent teaching faculty to General Education courses;
   ✦ provide courses specifically designed for and dedicated to General Education where appropriate;
   ✦ consider faculty commitment to the teaching of General Education in the promotion and tenure process; and
   ✦ articulate a coherent philosophy and pedagogy for their General Education program(s).

✦ Campuses, in including assessment as a necessary component of their General Education implementation plans, shall:
   ✦ review their entire General Education programs periodically to evaluate and strengthen performance;
✦ establish assessment programs for the specified student learning outcomes;
✦ derive evidence from the application of such assessment programs to show that the intended learning outcomes are being achieved; and
✦ use the results of assessment programs to improve the quality and effectiveness of General Education programs.

✦ Campuses may deliver General Education in a variety of formats, as judged appropriate by the campus faculty, and justified on curricular and pedagogical grounds. Campuses may also offer more than one General Education curriculum.

✦ For purposes of General Education, the campuses shall interpret the knowledge areas according to conventional or common definitions, but may, as appropriate, teach them through a variety of perspectives.

✦ The formats and methods of delivery for General Education courses shall be appropriate to each knowledge and skill area. Those courses that have been approved by a campus for its General Education program shall be monitored regularly by the campus faculty.

✦ Campuses are encouraged to conceive of and implement General Education programs that approach the goals of General Education as a four-year experience, thereby providing students with greater options for planning their courses of study, allowing for the needs of transfer students, and allowing faculties to devise curricula appropriate to individual majors and to institutional missions.

✦ General Education programs shall recognize differences in the levels of student preparation and build curricula both to assess and achieve a level of college competency. Campuses may waive individual requirements for students who can demonstrate college-level proficiency in specific knowledge and skill areas or competencies.

✦ Waivers will be available for specific programs with specialized mission or accreditation demands that would constrain a student's ability to fulfill the General Education Requirement without extending the time to graduation. Campuses with such programs may also propose alternative curricula designed to incorporate an appropriate portion of the General Education Requirement within their professional curricula, thereby reinforcing and enriching, rather than diverting from their mission and accreditation demands.

✦ Campuses that have resource constraints preventing them from fulfilling portions of the General Education policy by Fall 2000 may request additional time for implementation of specified portions of the policy.

✦ In keeping with Trustees’ Resolution 87-114 (and prior resolutions relating to Transfer Policy), courses certified as fulfilling particular General Education requirements by any institution in the system will fulfill those requirements at any other institution in the system, without the necessity of individual articulation agreements.
Students transferring from community colleges may complete as many as 30 credits of the General Education Requirement prior to transfer. Students planning to transfer into baccalaureate programs would be well advised to complete as much of the General Education Requirement as possible within their programs of study.

The Procedural Guidelines section of this report reflects the findings and recommendations of the Task Force Subcommittees on Resource Allocation and on Community College/Transfer Issues. It outlines the process for campus preparation of General Education curricula.

Campuses should use the following procedural guidelines when preparing their General Education program proposals:

- Campuses are charged with devising distinctive and varied ways of achieving the goals of General Education in the spirit of and within the parameters defined by the Trustees’ resolution. Each campus will develop one or more General Education curricula. Documents describing these programs will include analyses of resource needs and implementation timetables, and will be forwarded to the Provost’s Office between September 1 and December 31, 1999. After the initial implementation, campus General Education programs should be reviewed periodically, and within the context of the Mission Review process.

- The resolution regarding General Education carries resource implications. Short-term consequences derive from the necessity of investing in faculty and support resources in order to mount new courses by the fall of the year 2000. Over the long term, once the General Education policy is fully in place, campuses may find that course enrollments have shifted toward knowledge and skill areas where the costs of instruction are higher than in courses in which students currently enroll. Circumstances differ from campus to campus; therefore, campuses should carefully identify new instructional needs, and the costs associated with them as follows:
  - Each campus should provide an analysis of the costs associated with delivering the full General Education curriculum to its students beginning with the Fall 2000 semester.\(^5\)
  - Each campus should identify any significant start-up costs (i.e. library materials, hiring new faculty, technology, academic advisement, reprinting of catalogues).

---

\(^5\)The following method, with appropriate variations, may be employed as an approximate way of estimating costs. Determine the number of “seats” required by the General Education Requirement and the number of “seats” currently offered. The number of students who will be waived from portions of the General Education curriculum because of prior learning should be considered in this calculation. Convert the difference between the number required and the number available into FTE students not being served. Multiply the number of FTE students not being served by the funding level within the Budget Allocation Process for the type of course being taught to yield the State support projected for the new mix of students.
Each campus should look for alternative and collaborative ways to provide instruction, when appropriate and practical.

Each campus will determine college-level proficiency in order to waive individual students from specific General Education requirements on the basis of prior learning. Such determination shall be made according to the criteria specified in the campus’ General Education program proposal.

Campuses requesting waivers on the basis of mission or accreditation demands should submit written justification to the Provost’s office no later than December 31, 1999.

Campuses that have resource constraints preventing them from fulfilling portions of the General Education Requirement by Fall 2000, may request additional time for implementation of specified portions of the policy by including appropriate justification and a timetable for compliance in their General Education program proposals.

Though not bound by the Board Resolution, Community Colleges will also submit their General Education curricula so that courses can be certified as satisfying specific General Education requirements without the need for any further articulation agreement.

This section proposes a format campuses are to follow in submitting their proposals to the Office of the Provost. The General Education proposals submitted to the Provost’s Office should include:

**Curriculum Outline**
Campuses shall submit an overall outline of the General Education curriculum or curricula, including catalog descriptions and summaries of topics and readings to be covered for courses that satisfy each of the required knowledge and competency areas. These curriculum submissions shall also state criteria for waiving individual students from particular requirements on the basis of previous academic achievement (e.g., Regents exams, AP tests, campus-based measures).

**Program Waiver Requests**
Requests for program waivers or deferments of full implementation of the General Education Requirement may be submitted when warranted by special mission and/or accreditation requirements (see second “Resolved” clause of Resolution 98-241 [Appendix A]). Waiver and deferment requests must include justification, and in the case of deferments, proposed dates for full implementation.

**Statement of Resource Implications**
The proposal should include an analysis of resource requirements for the implementation of General Education, as described in the Procedural Guidelines section of this document.
Implementation Timeline

1. Submission of Campus General Education Program Proposals (including institutional and program waiver requests, and resource analyses) – September 1-December 31, 1999

2. Review of Campus General Education Program Proposals – October 1, 1999-April 30, 2000

3. Initiate implementation of General Education at state-operated campuses – Fall 2000

Recommendations

The Task Force appreciates fully the impact of this General Education Requirement on the campuses, and to ensure that the proposed implementation model functions smoothly, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

✦ that the Provost appoint an advisory group to make recommendations regarding General Education program and waiver proposals. It would be appropriate for this Provost’s General Education Review Advisory Council to meet frequently during the first year of implementation, and periodically thereafter;

✦ that campuses be advised orally at once, and by letter within ten working days, as proposals for programs and waivers are approved. Programs and waivers that receive conditional approval, contingent upon changes or additions, should also receive written confirmation within ten working days;

✦ that sufficient staff in the Provost’s Office be assigned to support system-wide implementation of the General Education Requirement;

✦ that additional designated State resources be made available to help support the implementation of General Education at two-year colleges, (e.g. hiring language or history instructors);

✦ that, within the framework of the Budget Allocation Process, funds be made available to support the implementation of General Education programs;

✦ that System Administration and the campuses collaborate in exploring ways to minimize costs;

✦ that funds be made available for pilot demonstration projects and for model programs involving the implementation and assessment of General Education; and

✦ that—after initial system-wide implementation of the General Education Requirement—the Provost’s Office should, in the context of the Mission Review process, review both (1) the design of General Education programs and (2) campus assessment programs and evidence that pertinent student learning outcomes are being achieved.
State University of New York Board of Trustees’ Resolution 98-241 Regarding General Education

Whereas setting the standards of knowledge possessed by the State University’s students when they graduate is one of the premier responsibilities of the Board of Trustees; and

Whereas the State Education Commissioner and State Board of Regents have moved to raise academic standards of New York State’s secondary schools which higher standards should be reinforced by rigorous academic standards in the State’s institutions of higher education; and

Whereas the Joint Task Force on General Education of the State University of New York Faculty Senate and Faculty Council of Community Colleges has reported the need for enhancing General Education curricula and recommended the adoption of common system-wide learning goals; and

Whereas the Board of Trustees’ Committee on Academic Standards, over a two-year period, has conducted public meetings in which General Education standards have been discussed, and representatives of the faculty and noted national experts have taken part; and

Whereas the Board of Trustees’ Subcommittee on General Education and Core Curriculum has reviewed and discussed the reports of the Faculty Senate and Faculty Council of Community Colleges and University Provost concerning General Education, including programs at other leading universities; and

Whereas the State University Board of Trustees possesses broad authority over the curriculum of its institutions under Section 355(2)(h) of the New York State Education Law; now, therefore, be it

Resolved that the Board of Trustees hereby adopts a General Education Requirement applicable to all state-operated institutions of the State University offering undergraduate degrees which shall require candidates for a bachelors degree, as a condition of graduation, to complete an academically rigorous and comprehensive core General Education curriculum of no fewer than 30 credit hours including, but not limited to, at least three credit hours of course work to instill knowledge and skills in each of the following key academic subjects: mathematics, natural science, social science, American history, Western Civilization, Other World Civilizations, humanities and the arts, foreign languages, basic communication and reasoning, and information management, and be it further

Resolved that implementation of the General Education Requirement be subject to the following principles:

1. The faculty of each institution will retain the responsibility for establishing the specific course requirements and content of a General Education curriculum reflective of the best practices in American higher education.
2. Individual campuses are encouraged to allow faculty to develop more than one curriculum which meets the General Education Requirement.

3. Each institution’s General Education curriculum shall complement and build on students’ foundation of secondary school or other prior academic preparation, especially with respect to mathematics, science and foreign language.

4. Each institution shall devote sufficient resources to the General Education program to assure effective instruction and successful learning.

5. Institutions offering Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees shall design their General Education Requirement so as to facilitate the ability of such Associates degree graduates to transfer into State University baccalaureate degree programs consistent with Trustees’ Resolution 90-196, dated September 27, 1990.

6. Such General Education curriculum courses shall be broad, high-quality courses that provide students with a set of non-specialized, coherent and focused educational experiences throughout the college years aimed at enabling students to acquire knowledge and skills that are useful and important for all educated persons regardless of their jobs or professions.

7. The Provost of State University may establish additional guidelines and procedures for implementation of these requirements as appropriate and necessary, which guidelines may permit waiver or modifications of portions of these requirements for the Specialized Colleges, Colleges of Technology, programs awarding two-year vocational degrees and for other special circumstances.

8. The requirements shall apply to students entering the State University as freshmen beginning in the fall of 2000.

and, be it further

Resolved that, in accordance with Section 6306(2) of the State Education Law, the State University Board of Trustees urges the boards of trustees of the community colleges operating under the program of the State University to adopt General Education Requirements and curricula consistent with the aforementioned principles; and, be it further

Resolved that the Provost of the State University will work with the leadership and faculty of the University’s campuses to develop a means for assuring that demonstrable learning in specified General Education subjects is taking place, that a campus’ implementation of General Education standards set forth in this resolution is considered in the allocation of resources to campuses and to explore ways to recognize and reward faculty who make major commitments to strengthening General Education at their campus so as to encourage the involvement of outstanding junior and senior faculty; and, be it further
Resolved that the Provost of the State University will work with the leadership and faculty of the State University’s campuses to implement this resolution, consistent with the Mission Review process. The Provost will advise the Board of any additional steps that may need to be taken to insure the smooth implementation of this resolution in a fashion that enhances access and quality at the State University.

Background
This Board, under the leadership of the Academic Standards Committee and the Subcommittee on General Education and Core Curriculum has taken a keen interest in the issue of General Education standards for the campuses of the State University of New York. This interest has been in keeping with a national discussion on the subject and, within the University, is reflected in efforts undertaken by the Joint Task Force on General Education of the State University of New York Faculty Senate and Faculty Council of Community Colleges. That Task Force issued a report in January 1998 which expressed the need for enhancing General Educational curricula and recommended the adoption of common, system-wide learning goals.

Over a two-year period, the Trustees’ Committee on Academic Standards has conducted public meetings in which General Education standards have been discussed and representatives of the faculty and noted national experts have taken part. Additionally, the Trustees’ Subcommittee on General Education and Core Curriculum has reviewed and discussed the above-mentioned report of the Joint Task Force and a Report prepared by the Provost of the State University dated December 1, 1998, which includes descriptions of General Education programs at leading universities around the country. This resolution is the result of these discussions and will establish for the state-operated institutions of the State University a General Education Requirement which will become a condition of graduation for the class of students entering as freshmen in the Fall semester 2000. The requirement consists of a minimum of 30 credit hours covering a number of specific skill and knowledge areas. The specific courses and content which will comprise the General Education curriculum at each State University campus will remain the responsibility of campus faculty and administrators.

This resolution also urges the boards of trustees of the community colleges operating under the program of the State University of New York to establish General Education curricula and requirements which will facilitate the transfer of their graduates into State University baccalaureate degree programs.

APPENDIX B – Trustees’ Resolution 90-196: Transfer and Articulation Policy

Whereas this Board by Resolution 72-302, adopted November 29, 1972, established a transfer policy guaranteeing graduates with Associate in Arts (A.A.) and Associate of Science (A.S.) degrees from two-year State-operated and community colleges within the State University of New York (SUNY) an opportunity to continue their education on a full-time basis at State University baccalaureate campuses and by Resolutions 80-53 and 87-114 adopted March 26, 1980 and June 24, 1987 respectively, further extended this policy to provide, among other things, that such students be accorded full junior status and credit transfer for general education courses; and
Whereas the University's transfer policy has served well SUNY's goal and mission of providing full access to the State's citizens to higher education and in order to renew and strengthen the University's commitment to the goals underlying this policy, it is desirable to reaffirm and extend the policy by making further provisions regarding its implementation; now, therefore, be it

Resolved that the principles constituting the transfer policy of State University of New York as outlined in Resolutions 72-302, 80-53, and 87-114 be, and hereby are, reaffirmed as follows:

1. New York State residents who are graduates of a State University two-year college, including the community colleges operating within the program of the University, and who possess an A.A. or A.S. degree, shall be guaranteed an opportunity to continue his or her education on a full-time basis at a baccalaureate campus of the University; and

2. Graduates of two-year colleges within SUNY with an A.A. or A.S. degree, when accepted in parallel programs at baccalaureate campuses of the University, shall be accorded full junior status and be given the opportunity to complete the requirements for a bachelor's degree within four additional semesters of full-time work; and

3. Graduates of two-year colleges within SUNY, when accepted with junior status within parallel programs at baccalaureate campuses of the University, shall be granted full credit for general education courses taken and not be required to repeat successfully completed courses with similar curricular content; and

4. Only those admissions requirements to institutions or to particular programs applicable to continuing and returning students shall be applied to SUNY A.A. and A.S. transfer students; and

5. These transfer students shall not be accorded, as far as possible, opportunities in areas such as housing, advisement and registration comparable to those of returning and continuing students; and be it further

Resolved that, beginning with the fall of 1991, the following additional principles shall pertain in the implementation of the SUNY's transfer policy

1. New York State residents who are graduates of a City University two-year college and who possess an A.A. or A.S. degree shall be guaranteed the same opportunity to continue his or her education on a full-time basis at a baccalaureate campus of the University as is accorded graduates from SUNY two-year colleges;

2. Baccalaureate campuses of SUNY in their enrollment planning shall give priority to A.A. and A.S. graduates of State University and City University of New York over other transfers;
3. Academic decisions on admissions for such transfer students shall be based solely on their previous collegiate records;

4. Baccalaureate campuses in making these admissions’ decisions shall pay particular attention to applications from A.A. or A.S. transfer students from their region who cannot relocate to another part of the State;

5. Baccalaureate campuses and two-year colleges of SUNY in close geographical proximity shall expand joint articulation agreements and, where appropriate, establish joint admission agreements; and, be it further

Resolved that these policy extensions to address place-bound transfer students do not diminish the expectation that SUNY baccalaureate campuses shall continue to provide access for A.A. and A.S. graduates from two-year colleges throughout the State, and be it further

Resolved that the Board reaffirms its intention that SUNY shall continue to provide access to first-time students at both its baccalaureate campuses and its two-year colleges; and be it further

Resolved that the document entitled “Guidelines for the State University of New York Transfer Policy” dated June 27, 1990 (copy on file in the Office of the Secretary of the University) be, and hereby is, approved and the Chancellor, or designee, be, and hereby is, authorized to amend and supplement said guidelines from time to time, in such manner as shall be determined to be appropriate.
### SUNY Pass Rates on the New York State Teacher Certification Examinations 1999–2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus/Category</th>
<th>Program Completers</th>
<th># Tested</th>
<th>% Tested</th>
<th># of Passes</th>
<th>Pass Rate</th>
<th>Statewide Pass Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Albany</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Science Test</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Totals</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Binghamton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Science Test</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Totals</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buffalo University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Science Test</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Totals</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stony Brook</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Science Test</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Totals</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brockport</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Science Test</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Totals</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buffalo State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Science Test</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Totals</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cortland</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Science Test</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Totals</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fredonia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Science Test</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Totals</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geneseo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Science Test</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Totals</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus/Category</td>
<td>Program Completers</td>
<td># Tested</td>
<td>% Tested</td>
<td># of Passes</td>
<td>Pass Rate</td>
<td>Statewide Pass Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Paltz</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Science Test</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Totals</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Westbury</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Science Test</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Totals</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oneonta</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Science Test</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Totals</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oswego</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Science Test</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Totals</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plattsburgh</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Science Test</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Totals</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potsdam</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Teaching Skills-Written</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Science Test</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Totals</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provo’s Advisory Council on Teacher Education
Report and Recommendations

March 2001
(Executive Summary)

Introduction

Teacher Education was historically the central function of many of the SUNY senior campuses, 11 of which were founded as Normal Schools specifically to prepare teachers. The State University has enjoyed an excellent reputation for its graduates who become teachers. Although missions have expanded and changed, each of the 11 original campuses has retained its commitment to educating teachers, and today 16 SUNY institutions grant degrees accompanied by teacher certification. Currently the State University of New York educates about 25% of the teachers certified in New York State each year through college and university programs.

Teacher education continues to evolve in response to reform initiatives. National reports have focused on: (1) the reform of teacher preparation as a complement to rising expectations for students in the schools, and (2) on the need for field- and performance-based teacher preparation. The need for alignment between preparation of teachers and the K-12 standards for learning is also a national concern. In 1988 the New York State Board of Regents adopted standards for learning at every level in K-12 schools, and in 1999 new regulations were adopted for teacher preparation programs.

In fall 1999, University System Provost, Peter Salins, appointed and charged an Advisory Council on Teacher Education (ACTE). The Council was charged with investigating and making recommendations on a wide range of issues that are encompassed by four major goals. These four goals constitute the outline of this, the Council’s first report, coming at the conclusion of over one year of deliberations.

Goal A

Strengthen and enhance all State University teacher education curricula and programs by:

Recommendation 1 –

Assuring that all students who are candidates for teaching certification have completed majors or concentrations whose content or discipline constitutes a “central content” area to be taught in the classroom.

SUNY teacher education institutions must prepare beginning teachers who have depth of study in one or more academic content fields that relate directly to their classroom teaching. Breadth of knowledge that an excellent General Education program can provide is essential for new teachers, and interdisciplinary majors with content essentially like that required of all students who undertake the program are appropriate.
**Recommendation 2 –**
Assuring that all pedagogy courses are based on tested and defensible concepts and methods that give candidates for certification the quality and breadth of skill they need to teach students with varied needs.

Classroom teachers must have command of the principles of best practice in pedagogy, and teachers must continually incorporate new findings from research that improve instruction and student learning. Teachers must demonstrate skill in classroom management as well as assessment of learning and curriculum.

**Recommendation 3 –**
Requiring more extensive clinical experiences and greater integration of theoretical and clinical education for students preparing for teacher certification.

Strong consensus exists that greater emphasis than at present is needed on clinical experiences and on the integration of theoretical and clinical education. Experiences in diverse school settings, with effort and dedication of full-time faculty, are requirements for effective teacher education. The system of incentives and accountability both for faculty and for classroom teachers who collaborate in preparing future teachers should be improved. Close collaboration among colleges, schools, and teachers is essential to effective teacher preparation.

**Recommendation 4 –**
Combining baccalaureate and master’s degree programs so students pursuing careers as teachers may complete requirements for both initial and professional certification more efficiently and in a more integrated manner.

Combined baccalaureate-master’s degree programs will be in greater demand as new Board of Regents regulations take effect. Combined programs can prepare prospective teachers more effectively, allowing sufficient time for both liberal arts education and pedagogical education.

**Goal B**

State University teacher education programs should respond to state needs by:

**Recommendation 5 –**
Increasing the number of State University candidates for teacher certification in titles with high need and in districts with high need.

Demographic analysis predicts a shortage of teachers in the U.S. and in New York State. Needs are already high in urban areas and in some certifications, including the natural sciences, mathematics, special education, early childhood education, English as a second language, and in languages other than English. In 1998-99 almost 16,000 New York State teachers were not certified in their fields, and almost 30,000 teachers in the state were over 55 years of age. Attrition among new teacher is also high.
**Recommendation 6** –
Facilitating the transfer of community college students to State University baccalaureate programs leading to teaching certification.

There is evidence of a high interest among community college students in pursuing teaching careers. Community colleges have the capacity to provide lower-division study in high-demand areas such as mathematics and the natural sciences. Community colleges can provide pre-student teaching field experience and may provide introductory education coursework, thereby facilitating completion of demanding teacher education curricula at the senior colleges. Access to teacher certification for place-bound community college students is a concern in some regions.

**Recommendation 7** –
Developing programs for “career changers,” individuals who have pursued another career and/or have later reached a decision to enter teaching as a career.

Some campuses can meet regional needs through such campus-based programs, and a SUNY-wide program should be developed to serve widely dispersed geographic needs. Many career changers have excellent undergraduate education and professional experience, and reports of their success as teachers are very positive.

**Goal C**
State University teacher education programs should dedicate greater effort to preparing teachers for the State’s urban school districts, where student and school needs call for special attention, by:

**Recommendation 8** –
Collaborating with the New York City Board of Education to establish a SUNY Urban Teacher Education Center (SUTEC) in New York City and supporting similar efforts in other cities.

If the state is to meet the need for qualified teachers in New York City and other urban areas, then SUNY must provide an increasingly larger number of teachers. Various factors in urban schools make it difficult to meet higher learning standards and school performance, as now mandated. Historically, the City University of New York provided a large proportion of the city’s teachers but at present meets only about one-quarter of the need.

**Goal D**
State University’s teacher education programs must sustain quality of performance and continuously strive for improvements by:

**Recommendation 9** –
Promoting research on the degree to which teacher education programs successfully prepare teachers to effect learning in the classroom.
Research offers the best hope to enable improved design of programs and enhanced teacher performance in the classroom. Expansion of research requires improving information systems for accumulating, analyzing and sharing data. Reasonable balance of faculty workloads is essential if research on teacher education programs is to be successful.

**Recommendation 10 –**

Faculty, campus administrators and System Administration taking actions to assure the continuing quality and improvement of teacher preparation

Program review by external consultants should be undertaken on a regular schedule by all teacher education programs. Accreditation is one endorsement of quality and helps to assure maintenance of high standards in teacher education programs. The proposed in-state accreditation option should be supported as it provides opportunity for an integrated approach to accreditation, designed in conjunction with state standards and regulations. Campuses will assess, through collaboration with school system employers, the quality of preparedness of new teachers who are SUNY graduates and respond to any concerns of employers. Campuses will accurately promote the quality of SUNY’s teacher preparation programs. The quality of SUNY teacher education programs should be publicly promoted.

**Implementing the Recommendations**

Effective implementation of these recommendations and actions requires, first, strong agreement from all sectors of the university on the issues to be addressed. Second, the cooperation of campus leaders, including Presidents, Provosts, program administrators and faculty, is essential in implementing the campus-level recommendations. Third, the System Administration must implement the system-wide recommendations and actions. Finally, this ambitious agenda requires the support of SUNY System Administration and campus leaders working with state officials to reform policy and acquire essential funding.
A New Vision in Teacher Education: Agenda for Change in SUNY’s Teacher Preparation Programs

The State University of New York will fulfill its commitment to educate excellent teachers through a System-wide action agenda with the following components.

✦ Assuring that students are thoroughly grounded in the subjects they teach

1. Students preparing to teach secondary or specialized subjects (i.e., English, Biology, Spanish, Music, etc.) will major in the relevant discipline, completing all required courses for the major. Additional courses in the major may be specifically designated for students preparing to teach.

   Responsibility: Campuses
   Timeframe: Applicable to students entering in fall 2001

2. Students preparing to teach in the elementary grades will complete an approved major or concentration directly related to the elementary curriculum (i.e., language arts/English, mathematics, etc.) of at least 30 credits with at least 18 credits at the upper division level.

   Responsibility: Campuses
   Timeframe: Applicable to students entering in fall 2002

✦ Assuring that students have completed integrated programs of clinical and pedagogical education that give them the skills to make their own K-12 students successful learners

1. SUNY will convene a series of forums involving SUNY faculty and administrators on best practices in (a) methods for teaching content areas; (b) integration of technology into instruction; (c) skills for classroom management and assessment of learning; and (d) integrating pedagogy with clinical education.

   Responsibility: System Provost
   Timeframe: First forum to be convened during 2001-2002

2. Students will complete not less than 100 hours of clinical experience in a school classroom before and exclusive of time spent in student teaching.

   Responsibility: Campuses
   Timeframe: Applicable to students entering in fall 2001

3. Student teaching will consist of a minimum of 75 days in classrooms and schools, [with 90 days being desirable] in two separate experiences, at least one of which is in a high-need school. Campuses should explore ways to enhance further and expand clinical experiences.

   Responsibility: Campuses and System Administration working with the New York State Education Department and school districts.
   Timeframe: Applicable to students entering in fall 2002

Give all SUNY students pursuing teaching careers the best possible preparation to become effective teachers by:
4. Experienced clinical faculty will supervise all field experiences. At many campuses additional costs are likely to be incurred to accomplish this goal.

Responsibility: Campuses, with support of System Administration
Timeframe: Applicable to students entering in fall 2001.

5. SUNY campuses will design integrated programs for qualified students that provide continuity from entry as freshmen through the Master's degree. Coursework credited toward the Master's degree will sustain balance among study in the subject matter to be taught, discipline-specific pedagogy, and clinical experience.

Responsibility: Campuses in consultation with the System Provost
Timeframe: Program design begins during 2001

✦ Forming partnerships with schools to accomplish SUNY's educational goals and to meet the schools' needs for excellent teachers and professional development for teachers

1. SUNY will promote, both within the System and with State officials, systematic involvement and recognition of the professional contributions of classroom teachers and schools in educating new teachers.

✦ SUNY will work with the State Education Department to develop ways to extensively involve school districts and their teachers to assist in educating new teachers.

Responsibility: System Administration and campus leaders
Timeframe: Initial discussions will be held during fall 2001

✦ SUNY will increase the stipend for cooperating classroom teachers who work with student/pre-service teachers by 50%, and other non-monetary incentives will be sought. Incentives will also be sought for cooperating teachers who supervise pre-student teaching experiences.

Responsibility: System Administration for stipends, campuses for non-monetary incentives
Timeframe: Stipend increase beginning in fall 2001

✦ SUNY teacher education faculty, in collaboration with schools and teachers, will devise methods of evaluating the contributions of classroom teachers to educating new teachers.

Responsibility: Campuses
Timeframe: By fall 2003

✦ Enabling more SUNY two-year college graduates to become teachers

1. A group of two- and four-year college faculty and administrators will be convened to design an academic program at two-year campuses for qualified students pursuing teacher education programs. The program would then be accepted by senior campuses as fulfillment of a portion of the teacher preparation curriculum. The two-year curriculum will be sensitive to accreditation issues and include:
ENVISIONED OUTCOMES

1. SUNY General Education Requirements;
   ✦ Introductory education courses and prerequisites for teacher education programs; and
   ✦ Initial practical experience or observation in a school classroom.

   Responsibility: System Provost will convene group; campuses provide advisement and program articulation
   Timeframe: Convene the group during fall 2001

2. Two-year and baccalaureate colleges will negotiate revised and jointly registered programs to bring more qualified two-year students into teacher education programs.

   Responsibility: Pairs of collaborating campuses
   Timeframe: To be completed by fall 2003

3. Two-year and baccalaureate colleges will collaborate to assure expert counseling and advisement of qualified two-year college students pursuing teaching certification programs.

   Responsibility: Pairs of collaborating campuses
   Timeframe: Begins with students entering in fall 2001

4. Partnerships of two-year and four-year campuses will be organized to assure broad geographic access to SUNY teacher preparation programs for place-bound students.

   Responsibility: The System Provost will survey the need and convene groups of collaborating campuses
   Timeframe: Appropriate regions to be identified by the end of 2001-2002; meetings to be convened by fall 2002

**Enabling working professionals and other educated adults to become teachers**

1. System Administration will work with individual campuses or groups of campuses to develop alternative certification programs for candidates who hold a baccalaureate degree and demonstrate competence in an appropriate content field. These programs will provide clinical experience in the classroom and instruction in relevant pedagogy.

   Responsibility: Campuses working with the System Provost
   Timeframe: Development begins immediately with first program(s) offered in fall 2002

2. Campuses will obtain formal agreements with school districts: to provide classroom mentor-teachers; to accommodate the integration of instruction in pedagogy for candidates; and to assure support for successful candidates until they obtain professional certification.

   Responsibility: Campuses
   Timeframe: Integrated into administration of programs

3. Creation of alternate certification programs will be targeted at high-need school districts and subject areas, and may also serve geographic areas without access to SUNY teacher certification programs.
Responsibility: System Administration will furnish background data and analyses, campuses will develop programs
Timeframe: Analysis to be conducted and interested campuses identified during 2001-2002

✦ Preparing more SUNY students to teach high-need subjects such as mathematics, science, special education and languages other than English

1. SUNY will advocate expansion of government incentive programs, such as New York’s Teachers of Tomorrow, to include undergraduates who pursue high-need teaching credentials.

   Responsibility: System Administration, with support from campus leaders
   Timeframe: Begins immediately

2. Campuses will undertake aggressive recruitment of students to pursue certification in high-need subjects.

   Responsibility: Campuses, with support from System Enrollment Management
   Timeframe: Ongoing as long as need exists

3. Campuses will pursue private funding for scholarships and incentives to address teacher shortages in high-need subjects.

   Responsibility: Campuses, with support of SUNY Research Foundation
   Timeframe: Ongoing as long as need exists

✦ Meeting the special challenges of urban public education in New York’s cities

1. SUNY will establish an Urban Teacher Education Center in New York City with the purpose to both increase the number of SUNY-educated teachers who take positions in the city’s schools and to serve as a laboratory for enhancing the effectiveness of teacher preparation for urban schools.

   Responsibility: System Provost
   Timeframe: Immediately

2. SUNY will promote increased service to the urban schools in other cities, such as Buffalo, Rochester and Syracuse and others, including the possible establishment of teacher education centers in these cities.

   Responsibility: The System Provost will initiate discussions with regional campus leaders
   Timeframe: Beginning during 2001-2002

✦ Subjecting them to rigorous external review and by earning accreditation

1. All programs will be accredited by a recognized agency

   Responsibility: Campuses
   Timeframe: Programs will be accredited by December 2004

2. The University supports the establishment of alternative accrediting agencies to provide choice for campuses.
Responsibility: System Administration
Timeframe: Immediately

✦ Conducting ongoing research on SUNY’s graduates and on best practices in elementary and secondary education

1. Campuses will survey school systems that employ SUNY-educated teachers and use information derived from surveys to respond to concerns and improve programs.

   Responsibility: Campuses
   Timeframe: Dialogue between campuses and schools to begin during 2001, surveys for collecting data will be completed by fall 2002

2. Both as a System and through the work of its faculty, SUNY will conduct research on best practices for preparing teachers, for gauging teaching effectiveness, and on identifying the characteristics of successful teachers. Results of research will be shared with the Board of Trustees and thereafter widely disseminated.

   Responsibility: System-wide research efforts will be organized by the System Provost, in consultation with appropriate faculty and administrative groups.
   Timeframe: Organization for research will be determined during 2001-2002

✦ Standing behind the professional competence of every graduate of SUNY education programs teaching in the State’s schools

1. On behalf of SUNY, the Chancellor affirms the University’s confidence in its teacher education programs. The System guarantees that every graduate of SUNY’s teacher education programs is fully prepared to assume responsibility as a teacher in the area of his or her certification. To this end the System will fund, during the candidate’s first two years of teaching, further education if needed.

   Responsibility: System Administration, in consultation with campus faculty and administrators, will develop a guarantee statement. The System Administration will use such statement to publicly promote and support the quality of its teacher education programs, and campuses will provide further education if needed
   Timeframe: Immediately

2. SUNY will engage its collaborating schools as partners in educating new teachers and will provide continuing professional development for in-service teachers.

   Responsibility: Campuses
   Timeframe: Ongoing
State University of New York
Budget Allocation Process

Implemented June 1998

Introduction

The State University of New York is a system that is larger and more diverse than any other state system in the nation. Its 64 colleges include research universities, land grant colleges, health science centers, comprehensive colleges, specialized colleges, technical colleges and community colleges. These colleges offer programs as varied as ceramics engineering, philosophy, fashion design, optometry, economics, maritime studies, and medical education.

The Budget Allocation Process, a combination of formulaic and non-formulaic measures, distributes State support to the 34 State-operated and statutory colleges, System Administration and University-wide programs (the 30 community colleges are funded by a different methodology). The distributed State support, in combination with campus tuition and certain other revenue, comprise the University's operating budget fund. Other self-supporting funds (e.g., residence halls, hospitals, most fee-based programs) are accounted for separately. The campuses have full discretion in the use of both State and campus generated revenue within State and University fiscal guidelines.

Allocation Methods

For almost 40 years, the State University's budget was defined by the appropriation of relatively detailed categories within each campus. To support requests for academic program initiatives, the University began in the late 1970's to use the “40-Cell Matrix,” a faculty/student ratio model based on four instruction levels and ten discipline groups. In 1985, the “flexibility legislation” provided the System and campuses more budgetary autonomy, and the “Benchmark” emerged as the primary method for allocating appropriations. The Benchmark incorporated the basic structure of the earlier FTE-based, 40-cell matrix, but also included funding in relation to headcount enrollments, sponsored program activity, square footage of campus facilities and the actual cost of utilities. Funding for the statutory colleges (Cornell and Ceramics) was not determined using the Benchmark model.

The Benchmark focused on overall campus conditions and, through a process of phased distribution of funding support among the campuses, brought the relative campus funding levels closer to the total University average support condition. However, by 1994-95, the total funding available to the University was out of line with the normative level indicated using the Benchmark. Eventually, the Benchmark was perceived to be too complex and less effective in establishing campus allocations, especially in light of changes in administrative regulations and funding patterns; the need for a new methodology was evident.
Allocation Methodology Committee

A committee of the State University Business Officers Association (SUBOA), in conjunction with System Administration staff, was formed in 1992 to investigate the issues and concerns surrounding the Benchmark. Three factors provided motivation for the initial work of the SUBOA Allocation Methodology Committee:

✦ campus pressure for an allocation process that was simpler, easier to understand, and more predictable over time
✦ the need for clearer demarcation of the funding support provided for the fundamental missions of instruction, research, and public service
✦ an interest in treating State tax dollar support separately from tuition revenue, opening the potential for campuses to retain their tuition and fee income

In 1995, the Committee was reconstituted as a joint effort of SUBOA, the Academic Officers (ACAO) and System Administration (Budget and Finance, Provost's Office, and Construction Fund); later, a representative of the University Faculty Senate joined the Committee (see Attachment 1).

In Spring 1996, the Committee drafted a conceptual proposal, identifying specific issues for further examination. After an initial presentation of the Committee's deliberations and progress to the Board of Trustees, the Committee was temporarily expanded to include four task groups charged with reviewing several core issues: campus groupings and peers, organized research and public service, geographic issues (i.e., salaries and utilities), and facilities investment (including debt service, rehabilitation and maintenance and capital costs; this was not included in the final version of the methodology). Additional campus staff members were asked to assist the Allocation Methodology Committee in the work of the task groups as they examined relevant data, existing practices and policies, and developed recommendations.

The Committee's initial results were first presented to the Board of Trustees and then to the Presidents' Planning and Priorities Committee. Based on these meetings, adjustments were made and a draft document was distributed to campus presidents for comment and discussion at a Chancellor's Forum held in December, 1996. In May, 1997, the Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees was designated Board liaison to the Allocation Methodology Committee.

The Committee submitted a report to the Vice Chancellor for Finance in October, 1997, and a series of meetings was held with the Board of Trustees, System Administration senior officers, campus presidents and officers, Legislative and Division of the Budget staff and the Faculty Senate. Based on the discussions and comments by the various University constituencies and after consultation with the Committee, the Vice Chancellor for Finance and the University Provost recommended a new budget allocation process in May, 1998. The new allocation process was used as the basis for the State University's Financial Plan adopted by the Board of Trustees in June 1998.
Budget Allocation Process

The new allocation methodology was developed to:

✦ relate the allocation of State support to campus missions and the results achieved in the pursuit of those missions
✦ provide incentives to improve the quality of instruction and research, enhance access and promote efficiency
✦ continue the sharing of financial responsibility between the System and campuses
✦ distribute State support to all State-operated and statutory colleges in an equitable, open and predictable manner
✦ permit campuses to retain and manage their resources and assume responsibility for the costs of local decisions

Under the new allocation process, funding for the University's operating budget is allocated according to five major components:

Campus Retention of Tuition
✦ Campuses retain all tuition and fee revenue currently pooled in the operating budget.

Enrollment
✦ Total funded enrollment is categorized into a 12 cell matrix by student level and discipline group.
✦ State support is based on the relative cost and percent of State support for each cell.
✦ Core funding for a complement of basic staff is provided to campuses below 5,500 FTE students (funding is phased out for campuses between 3,000 and 5,500 students).
✦ A geographic adjustment is provided based on cost of living variances by campus location.
✦ Graduate support and tuition support is provided.

Research and Public Service
✦ Campuses are encouraged to seek outside funding for research and public service by the provision of a 20% State match for both direct and indirect external support.
✦ Research and public service institutes currently supported in the campus budgets that have a history of State-initiated funding, select programs, and land grant and forestry activities are funded in the new allocation process.
Mission Adjustments

- Program-related mission adjustments are provided to a limited number of campuses with unique and extraordinary resource needs.
- Campus-specific adjustments include statutory mandates or unique costs that constitute a significant portion of the campus budget.
- University-wide activities and System Administration are supported based on statutory requirements or levels set by the Board of Trustees.
- Mission Review funding provided assistance to campuses implementing changes in their missions.

Performance

- The new allocation process incorporates performance incentives within the previous components.
- In addition, a separate performance component will provide “bonuses” for achievement and improvement in campus quality.

The greater simplicity reflected in the new methodology’s funding components compared to the Benchmark is consistent with the movement toward greater campus autonomy in the internal distribution of resources. As campuses exercise more authority in academic and fiscal matters, they also assume greater responsibility for the cost variations which result from local decisions.

In addition to the direct State General Fund support appropriated to the University, the new allocation process treats as State support for distribution, moneys collected from self-supporting operations (hospitals, residence halls and other activities) for the payment of their fringe benefit and debt service expenses. Interest earnings that can not be attributed to a specific campus are also distributed under the new allocation process.

Campus Retention of Revenue

With the implementation of the new budget allocation process, campuses:
- are credited with all tuition revenue
- retain all fee revenue previously pooled in the University Income Fund in support of campus operations. Such fees include those for late registration, late payment, bad check charges, add/drop, transcript, library fines, graduate and professional admissions
- collect or pay interest based on individual campus fund balances

The new allocation process was developed based on the current tuition policies which require standard, system-wide tuition rates for each degree. While campuses are credited with their own revenue, State law requires that the revenue be deposited in the State treasury and expended through the Office of the State Comptroller.
The new allocation process includes recognition of high, medium and low cost factors for four levels of instruction (12 cells) and separate factors for health-related professional degree programs. Relative weights and State support percentages are assigned to each cell:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>State Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division-Low Cost</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division-Medium Cost</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division-High Cost</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division-Low Cost</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division-Medium Cost</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division-High Cost</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Graduate-Low Cost</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Graduate-Medium Cost</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Graduate-High Cost</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Graduate-Low Cost</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Graduate-Medium Cost</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Graduate-High Cost</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optometry</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Medicine</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relative cost of each cell is based on the combination of the cell’s direct instructional costs and a flat amount per student for academic and institutional support costs. These relative costs are indexed to the lower division, low cost category (index value of 1.0) to generate the weights reflected in the above chart. The weights will be reviewed periodically, possibly every three years, to ensure that they continue to reflect accurately cost relationships within the cells and the University. However, the relative costs for the cells will be updated annually to reflect collective bargaining agreements and inflation. These revised costs are multiplied by the State support percentages, resulting in a net State support per cell which includes the increases.

State support percentages reflect the approximate tax dollar support levels required to maintain tuition rates at current levels. By including the State support percentages, the new allocation methodology recognizes both the differences in instructional costs and the university-wide standardization of tuition rates. The assigned State support percentages approximate the remaining support levels required after tuition and fees.

An academic discipline is placed in a high, medium or low cost group based on the average cost per FTE student for that discipline throughout the University. The grouping of disciplines is specific to student level, making it possible to have the same discipline listed as high cost at one level and low cost at another level. Attachment 2 lists the distribution of disciplines into the 12 cells used in the new
allocation process. The health-related first professional values were developed using both campus data and, where available, information from collegiate associations in each field.

The academic and institutional support cost included in the 12 cells is calculated as a uniform amount throughout the University and covers libraries, student support, organized activities, maintenance and operations, administration and institutional services based on the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) classifications.

The campus funded enrollment is distributed into each cell based on the campus’s most recent actual percent distribution by student level and discipline. The funded annual average full-time equivalent (AAFTE) enrollment is a weighted, average enrollment for three years. Year one, weighted at 50%, is the planned enrollment for the year to which the new allocation methodology is being applied. Year two, weighted at 30%, is the official enrollment for the preceding year. Year three, weighted at 20%, is the official enrollment for the year prior to year two. In order to temper enrollment fluctuations, in years two and three of the funded enrollment calculation, actual enrollments will be limited to 2% above the planned enrollments. Campuses will retain the tuition benefit from enrollment which exceeds the planned enrollment, but additional State support to those campuses will be limited in future distributions by the 2% cap.

The new allocation methodology is sensitive to enrollment fluctuations and trends; therefore, sound fiscal management will require effective enrollment management. The new allocation process requires close campus attention to enrollment planning but allows for modest fluctuations in achieving enrollment targets. Significant shortfalls from planned enrollment levels are discouraged through subsequent adjustments in State support the following year. Enrollment planning occurs in a collaborative manner between the campuses and System Administration.

Core Institutional Support
Every institution of higher education has administrative and institutional costs required to support the educational activity of the campus. Such expenditures include the salaries of a president, vice-presidents, clerical support staff, etc. Most campuses can support the core staff once the campus has reached an appropriate level of enrollment or total budget; the new allocation methodology recognizes this enrollment level at 5,500 AAFTE. Campuses below 5,500 AAFTE, but greater than 3,000 AAFTE, receive a partial level of core support in direct proportion to the enrollment above 3,000 AAFTE. Campuses below 3,000 AAFTE receive full core support (set at $1.7 million for 1998-99). However, if the core funding represents less than 5% of the campus operating budget, its value is not considered significant in relation to the overall campus budget; in this case the core adjustment is not provided. The core support is in addition to the support generated in the enrollment-based component.

Geographic Differential
A key part of the University’s mission is to provide the broadest possible access to students across the State. This results in campuses being located in a variety of regions, with significant differences in costs of living and wage levels. A consultant
was engaged to establish a cost of living index for each campus. Based on the report, a geographic adjustment is applied to campuses whose cost of living index is at least 10% above the lowest campus index, but caps the differential at 23% above the lowest campus index (resulting in a maximum adjustment of 13%). The enrollment generated support and core funding are increased by the appropriate campus percentage since these are derived from system averages. The other components of the new allocation process are not adjusted since their costs are campus-specific and already reflect the impact of geographic differences.

**Graduate Support/Tuition Support**
The State support percentages assigned in the enrollment component assume that campuses collect all tuition revenue; however, tuition waivers currently provided to many graduate students, and to other categories of students and staff, diminish the amount of tuition revenue collected by the campuses. The new allocation process provides graduate tuition support at a level determined by the Provost’s Office to offset the impact of waivers. In addition, since the State support percentages assume a baccalaureate level tuition, this category includes support to eliminate the impact of the lower tuition rates charged for associate degree students at campuses with a substantial portion of enrollment in associate degree programs.

**Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity**
Research, scholarship and creative activity are essential components of the University’s mission, and provide critical learning experiences for both graduate and undergraduate students. They are essential to the success of the nation’s leading universities, and contribute significantly to the State’s economic, cultural and social development. The new allocation process supports research and public service through incentive-based funding and the recognition of certain existing programs.

**Support for Sponsored Programs**
Success in attracting external funding for research and other sponsored activity is an indication of the academic strength and vitality of our campuses. The new allocation process, therefore, encourages this activity and the pursuit of external funding. As an incentive to reward both the expansion of sponsored activity and the maximization of indirect support, the new allocation process provides a State support match at 20% of the total direct and indirect expenditures from sponsored funds. The level of sponsored activity is determined based on a three-year weighted average of expenditures. Year one, weighted at 50%, is the most recently published data. Year two, weighted at 30%, reflects the expenditures for the prior year. Year three, weighted at 20%, is the year prior to year two.

**Campus Budgeted Research & Public Service**
Many campuses have designated programs or institutes that have been supported in the operating budget. Eventually, such critical work will be funded through a combination of mission funding and a richer level of overall support for sponsored research. The shift to incentive-based support has the potential of changing existing levels of support for campus research and public service operations. This is especially the case for existing programs that are supported primarily by internal University funds, such as those previously distributed in the Graduate...
Research Initiative. To minimize this impact, the first year of implementation continues to support the direct cost of a number of these activities and provides indirect support at an additional 30% of direct support. It is anticipated that the mission review process will consider the performance and funding of these programs. In addition to these internally funded programs, a number of programs within the campus budgets have legislative, executive or statutory origins. The direct support for these institutes has been continued as well, with an additional 30% for indirect support.

Funding for specific research and public service programs is categorized as follows:

✦ **University Research Initiative** – Programs or institutes that had received at least partial funding from the Graduate Research Initiative. The Provost’s Office, with assistance from the University Research Council, will examine the most effective application of these funds in the future.

✦ **State-initiated Funding** – Programs or institutes initially supported by the State as Governor’s initiatives, legislative programs or member items, or recognized as University-wide programs.

✦ **Land Grant and Forestry Missions** – The Statutory Colleges at Cornell are designated as New York State’s land grant institution as authorized in the Federal Morill Act. In a similar manner, Environmental Science and Forestry and Cornell receive federal funds for forestry programs under the McIntire-Stennis Act. These institutions have specifically chartered research and public service programs which are included in their operating budgets. These specific mission-based programs are designed to address critical State needs that often are not priorities for sponsors that provide external support.

Mission adjustments and Mission Review funding provide a means of recognizing the reasonable and appropriate support requirements of campuses within a system as diverse as the State University of New York.

✦ **Mission Adjustments** – A limited number of campuses have academic programs which require extraordinary educational resources to meet their academic requirements. The allocation process supports these expenses, but restricts them to reasonable costs which are not supported in the enrollment-based calculations. An example is the maintenance costs of the training ships at the Maritime College. In addition, a number of University-wide activities are budgeted separately and distributed to the campuses in the financial plan process (e.g., academic equipment, student financial aid, programs for disadvantaged). These programs and support for System Administration are funded at levels set by the Board of Trustees.

✦ **Mission Review** – The Mission Review process, launched in April, 1998, is intended to achieve clarity and consensus on the mix and level of teaching, research and service on each campus. Some campuses may require ongoing support, others may need assistance in implementing changes in their missions. The University’s financial plan includes a pool of resources which will be used to support funding adjustments identified during the Mission Review process.
Linking performance and outcomes to funding should be a fundamental characteristic of a planning and resource allocation method. In public higher education, attempts to incorporate performance funding in resource allocation are relatively new and have met with varied success.

The major components of the new allocation process already incorporate performance in several elements of the methodology. For example, by offering a high quality educational opportunity, a campus enhances its ability to meet enrollment goals and is then rewarded both in the new allocation process enrollment component and by the retention of the tuition revenue. Moreover, by providing State support for sponsored program expenditures (a 20% State match), the new process encourages campuses to attract these outside dollars. Finally, effective campus management is encouraged by allowing campuses to retain any savings generated by cost containment.

In addition to these elements, a distinct performance component will be introduced beginning in 1999-2000. It will include measures to identify and reward:

- student achievement
- faculty achievement
- academic robustness
- quality of campus services and environment

New State support is recommended for the first phase of performance funding. This introduces performance review in a positive manner, and is an effective means of rewarding current levels of achievement and encouraging significant improvements yet to be attained. The second phase, incorporating the use of some existing funds with new funding, would demonstrate the University’s commitment to a higher level of performance. The Office of the Provost has recommended a set of performance indicators and will collaborate with the Vice Chancellor for Finance, with the advice of the University Allocation Methodology Committee and the Performance Indicators Task Force, in determining the most effective way of introducing performance in the total resource allocation process.

Implementation is a crucial aspect of any change to a new allocation method. To avoid major disruptions in campus funding, a “collar” has been established so that no campus’s allocation is reduced by more than 2% in any one year due to the new budget process (1% in the first year). Initially, it is proposed that the new allocation process be phased in over a three year period. However, the “collars” will be evaluated periodically to ensure that movement towards targeted campus allocations will occur within a reasonable time frame. Since the new budget allocation process distributes State support, which in total can vary from year to year, the desired enhanced predictability is in the application of the process, not in the specific amount of State support provided to campuses. Therefore, the phase-in of significant changes is essential.

The annual budget request process will continue to seek State funding for negotiated salary increases, inflationary price increases and specific University...
The new allocation methodology will then be used to allocate the State funding enacted in the State budget. Initiatives which are restricted for a specific use will be held as university-wide programs and will be distributed based on the designated purpose or intent. The structure of the new allocation methodology, with its various components, provides the University with a mechanism to request additional State support related to enrollment increases, research growth and improved performance.

The new allocation method will be carefully reviewed to ensure that it is operating in a manner consistent with the overall policy direction of the University. It is expected that further refinements, within the existing overall structure will occur over the next few years, especially as the University completes the Mission Review process.

Conclusion

The five components of the new budget allocation process—campus retention of tuition, enrollment-based funding, research and public service, campus and mission related adjustments, and performance—constitute a balanced allocation method that recognizes both the similar and unique characteristics of the most diversified university system in the nation. Taken as a whole, the new allocation process recognizes quality, encourages management decisions at the local level, rewards effective stewardship and provides access to all students.

The State University wishes to thank the following for their support and advice during this effort:

✦ The Allocation Methodology Committee
✦ SUBOA and ACOA leadership
✦ The Task Groups
✦ The Performance Indicators Task Force
✦ The Office of Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business and Staff
✦ The Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Staff
✦ The Faculty Senate
✦ The Presidents’ Planning and Priorities Committee
✦ The Campus Presidents
✦ The Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees
✦ The Board of Trustees
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# Quantitative Information

What follows is a summary regarding University performance in key operational areas. Data shown is the most recent available as of this report.

## Enrollment

With 374,377 students enrolled in fall 2000, the State University reached its largest student body since 1995.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 1999</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment</td>
<td>374,377</td>
<td>372,443</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Operated</td>
<td>192,929</td>
<td>190,746</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Employees

In total, the State University added 221 employees between 1999 and 2000, improving services to our students and helping to support the New York State economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 1999</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>73,236</td>
<td>72,884</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>13,676</td>
<td>13,721</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Research

As noted earlier, the Chancellor is committed to increasing the research enterprise across the University and looks forward to working with the State University Trustees and System and campus leadership to build on progress made to date. Total sponsored activity at SUNY campuses (including the Partnership Colleges) continued to rise between FY 98/99 and FY 99/00.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 99/00</th>
<th>FY 98/99</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$512.0</td>
<td>$467.6</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## System Sponsored Program Activity

The Sponsored Programs Office, within the Office of the Provost, is responsible for administering funds awarded to the University's Research Foundation in support of research, training, programs and activity conducted by System Administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 99/00</th>
<th>FY 98/99</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$43,104,085</td>
<td>$38,017,591</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Degrees Granted

The State University grants more than 69,000 degrees each year. For the period July 1, 1999 to June 30, 2000, the University awarded:

✦ 29,228 Associate’s Degrees;
✦ 28,443 Bachelor’s Degrees;
✦ 8,039 Master’s Degrees;
✦ 1,021 Doctoral Degrees;
✦ 1,063 First Professional Degrees;
✦ 1,499 Undergraduate Certificates; and
✦ 581 Graduate Certificates.

Alumni Survey

The 1999 Undergraduate Alumni Survey was administered on behalf of the State University by ACT. With a 4 percent +/- margin for error, a total of 99,894 alumni of both state-operated and community college alumni were sampled. Demographic characteristics of the 19,682 respondents were as follows:

✦ 65% female, 35% male;
✦ 88% white, 12% minority;
✦ 73% employed full-time;
✦ 15% employed part time; and
✦ 4% continuing with full-time education.

Alumni responses included the following: when asked if they would begin again, 80 percent said they would choose the same State University college; 87 percent rated their institution overall as “good” or better; and 97 percent said they would recommend the college to a friend.

In a rating of their respective colleges on multiple factors, the highest ranking categories were: (1) high quality academic programs; (2) cultural/ethnic diversity in student body; (3) opportunities for student involvement; and (4) opportunities for student/faculty interaction.
In fiscal year 1997-98, the State Legislature approved a $2.15 billion capital plan for the State University: $1.7 billion for educational facilities, $250 million for residence halls, and $200 million for community colleges. The plan provided a fully funded multi-year process to address the capital facilities needs in support of the University's long-range academic goals. As a result, the State University has significantly increased the level of its capital programs for both new construction and rehabilitation and repairs. Reflecting the expanded program and delivery of construction awards, expenditures increased dramatically in the 1999-2000 fiscal year; $274.7 million was disbursed for construction and rehabilitation of academic facilities, and $54.8 million was disbursed for construction and rehabilitation of residence halls. An additional amount of $5 million was disbursed to provide equipment for new facilities and land acquisition.

Funding for capital construction and rehabilitation of academic facilities of the State University is supported principally through the issuance of bonds by the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York (DASNY), the debt service for which is provided through a direct State appropriation. In FY1999-2000, the State University entered into agreements with the DASNY to issue obligations in the amount of $246 million for the purpose of financing new construction for academic facilities. In addition, the State University entered into agreements with the DASNY to issue obligations in order to refinance certain existing educational obligations in the amount of $261 million to reduce future aggregate debt service payments through lower interest costs.

Funding for capital construction and rehabilitation of residence halls is provided from the issuance of bonds by the Dormitory Authority and from reserve funds accumulated by each campus from operating revenues. The State University's residence halls program is completely self-supporting, with debt service and
operating costs paid from occupancy fees charged to the resident students at each

campus. During 1999-2000, the State University entered into agreements with the DASNY to issue obligations in the amount of $187 million for the purpose of financing new construction for residential facilities.

As of April 2001, 130 projects (valued at $346 million) were under design and 12 projects, with a construction value of $20 million, were in the bid award process. In addition, 196 projects were under construction; these projects have a contract value of $626 million.
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Booker Edgerson, Director of Affirmative Action
Daniel Penfold, Executive Vice President for Student Affairs
Thomas Quatroche, Assistant to the President
William Reuter, Chief Administrative Fiscal Officer

Fashion Institute of Technology
Joyce F. Brown, President
Dario A. Cortes, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Irene Buchman, Acting Dean of Business and Technology
Joseph Costelli, President of the Faculty Association
Helena Glass, Registrar
Diane Phillips, Director of Institutional Research
Annette Piecora, Executive Assistant to the President
Harvey Spector, Vice President for Finance and Operations, and Treasurer

Finger Lakes Community College
Daniel T. Hayes, President
James W. Ware, Vice President of Academic Affairs and Dean of the College
Robert Belmont, Trustee
Jean M. D’Abbiaucci, Professor of Nursing
Michele Howland, Assistant Dean for Institutional Grants
Richard Larkin, Assistant Professor, Hotel and Resort Management/Business Department

Fulton-Montgomery Community College
Joseph Bulmer, Past Interim President
Priscilla J. Bell, Past President
Robert W. Kuske, Vice President and Dean of the College
Judy A. Allen, Director of Financial Aid and Co-Chair of the Planning Committee
William Lomanto, Director of the Learning Center, and Chair, Assessment Committee
Arthur Recesso, President, Faculty Association of College Educators
Anna D. Weitz, Vice President for Student and Community Services
**Genesee Community College**
Stuart Steiner, President
Claudia Moore, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
Ruth Andes, Acting Assistant Dean for Assessment and Special Projects
Joanne Cepelak, Dean for Curriculum and Instruction
Peggy Curry, Dean of Off-Campus Instruction, The Center for Business and Community Education
Bruce Hilyard, Professor of English
Larene Hoelcle, Vice President for Human Resources and Planning
Mel Wentland, Board of Trustees

**Herkimer Community College**
Ronald F. Williams, President
Patricia Pietropaolo, Past Dean of Academic Affairs
Jennifer Boulanger, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs
John D. Bullis, Dean of Institutional Advancement
James Hayes, Dean of Students
Robert Kane, Dean of Administration and Vice President
David Mahoney, Trustee
Peter Turner, Assistant Professor for Humanities and Social Science

**Hudson Valley Community College**
John L. Buono, President
James J. LaGatta, Past Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs
James Macklin, Director of Institutional Research and Planning
Gerard McEnaney, President, Academic Senate
Holly Pennock, Director of School Programs and Educational Outreach
(Assisting Academic VP on Project)

**Jamestown Community College**
Gregory T. DeCinque, President
Gary F Porter, Dean of Academic Affairs
C. Berkeley Adams, Professor of Psychology
Robert L. Barber, Dean of Continuing Education
Mary Ellen Bonno, Trustee (Vice-chair)
Gary W. Winger, Dean of Administration and Development
Marilyn A. Zagora, Dean of Student Development and Marketing

**Jefferson Community College**
John W. Deans, President
Katherine F. Fenlon, Academic Dean
Patricia Clark, Assistant Registrar
Gail C. Phillips, Chair, Jefferson Community College Board of Trustees
David Reid, Professor of English
Penny R. Sweredoski, Dean of Administration
Alexander Pope Vickers, Assistant Professor Hospitality and Tourism
Mohawk Valley Community College
Michael I. Schafer, President
John K. Bolton, Jr., Vice President for Instruction
Josephine Alexander, Chair, Education and Social Services
Jerome M. Alvermann, Vice President for Administrative Services
Denise DiGiorgio, Vice President for Student Services
Robert Jubenville, Chair, Life Sciences
Denis Kennelty, Director of Admissions
Rebecca Lo, Director of Institutional Assessment
William Perrotti, Professor of Life Sciences
Donald Reese, Executive Director of the Center for Community and Academic Development

Monroe Community College
R. Thomas Flynn, President
Peter A. Spina, Past President
Vicky Smith, Past Vice President of Academic Services
Jeffrey P. Bartkovich, Vice President, Educational Technology Services
Tony Caizza, President, Faculty Senate
Richard J. Degus, Executive Assistant to the President

Nassau Community College
Sean A. Fanelli, President
John Ostling, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mary Adams, Secretary of the Board of Trustees
Sidney Becker, Chair, Reading and Basic Education
William Domroe, Chair, Board of Trustees
Joann LaPerla, Dean of Instruction
Lynn Rubin, President, Student Government Association
Thomas Sands, Chair, Academic Senate

Niagara County Community College
Antonette Cleveland, President
Paul Ferington, Dean of Academic Affairs
Mary Jane Feldman, Director of Institutional Research
Anthony Gullo, Professor and Chair, Social Science Division
Greg MacConnell, Dean of Student Affairs
Jean McKenna, Dean of Life Long Learning
Catherine Peuquet, Acting Associate Dean of Instructional Development and Evaluations
Marcy Stoll, Past Associate Dean of Academic Affairs

North Country Community College
Gail Rogers Rice, President
Douglas Wilmes, Dean of Academic Affairs
Sandra Baker, Administrative Assistant to the Dean of Academic Affairs, and Records Officer
Jane Carpenter, Associate Professor of Business and Office Technologies
Michael DeVincenitis, Instructor, Social Sciences
Margot Gold, Instructor, Community Mental Health
Dana Wood, Enrollment Management Assistant
Onondaga Community College
Debbie L. Sydow, President
Joseph J. Bulmer, Past Interim President
Kevin Moore, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs
J. Robert Johnson, Director of College K-12 Outreach
Sharon Testone, Professor and Math Diagnostics Coordinator

Orange County Community College
Preston Pulliams, President
Yolaine Armand, Vice President for Academic Affairs
John Cummins, Past Vice President for Academic Affairs
Arthur Anthonisen, Chairman, Board of Trustees
Kirk A. Manning, Vice President for Student Development
Morton Meyers, Past Executive Vice President and Vice President for Administration
Mindy Ross, President, Campus Governance System

Rockland Community College
George Hamada, President
Helen Chun, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Josephine Figueras, Dean of Enrollment Management
Ray Harter, Past Vice President for Finance and Administration
Thomas Judd, Director of Institutional Research
Elaine Padilla, Professor, Anthropology and Sociology
Paul Shiffman, Vice President of Planning and Advancement
Maria Vallejo, Vice President of Student Affairs

Schenectady County Community College
Gabriel Basil, President
Thomas J. Nelson, Dean of Academic Affairs
Rosemary Castelli, Past Dean of Academic Affairs
Bernice Dunn, Counselor III, Student Affairs
John Schroeder, Professor, Department of Mathematics, Science and Technology
Stanley Strauss, Associate Dean, Planning and Development

Suffolk County Community College
Salvatore J. LaLima, President
James F. Canniff, Vice President for Academic and Campus Affairs
Jessica Allen, Deputy to the President
Joanne Braxton, Executive Dean, Western Campus
Allie Parrish, Executive Dean, Eastern Campus
Wayne Pevey, Executive Dean, Ammerman Campus
Eric Ricopppo, Vice President for Marketing and Public Affairs
Steven Schrier, Vice President for Administration and Information Services
Charles Stein, College Financial Officer
Michael Weissberg, Vice President for Student Affairs
Sullivan County Community College
Mamie Howard Golladay, President
Jonathan Gonder, Vice President for Academic and Student Services
Paul Goldstein, Past Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Larry Barrett, Director of Admissions and Registration Services
Elizabeth A. Kubenik, Vice President for Administrative Services and Records Access Officer
Rosa Mason, Director of Human Resources
Richard M. Sush, Dean of Student Services and Records Access Officer

Tompkins Cortland Community College
Carl E. Haynes, President
John Reed Conners, Dean of Academic Affairs
Jane Hammond, Associate Dean, Academic Planning and Research
Scott Ochs, Associate Professor and Chair, Sociology and Social Sciences Department
Walter Poland, Dean of Student Services
Janet Swinnich, Professor, Physics and Engineering
Richard Van Donsel, Chair, Board of Trustees

Ulster County Community College
Donald C. Katt, President
Barbara A. Adams, Past President
John Ganio, Past Interim Vice President and Dean of the Faculty
Lawrence Berk, Director of Library and Information Services
Ann M. Marrott, Associate Dean for Enrollment Management
Margaret Ordansky, Associate Professor and Chair of Biology, and Chair of General Education Committee
Steven Plumb, Assistant Professor of Engineering and President of Faculty Association
Dennis Swauger, Professor of Chemistry and Title III Activity Director

Westchester Community College
Joseph N. Hankin, President
John F. M. Flynn, Vice President and Dean, Academic Affairs
Iris Cook, Chair, Middle States Accreditation Steering Committee (Biology Department)
Nelson Huang, Assistant to the President
Marcia M. Lee, Director, Institutional Research and Planning
Jay Paisley, Professor and Counselor, Student Personnel Services
Mission Review System Interlocutors

Manuel Alguero, Director, Office of Hispanic American Affairs
Anthony Belcher, Associate for Opportunity Programs
Craig Billie, Associate for Data and Analysis, Institutional Research and Analysis
Robert Blanton, Data Manager, Institutional Research and Analysis
Gary Blose, Assistant Provost for Data and Analysis, Institutional Research and Analysis
Peter Brickman, Senior Programmer Analyst, Institutional Research and Analysis
Elizabeth Bringsjord, Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs
Kerry Brousseau, Assistant University Financial Analyst
Robert Brown, Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges
Ronald Brown, Director, Information Technology Exchange Center
Ginette Chambers, Director, Faculty Awards and Development
Deidre Clark, Assistant Provost for Opportunity Programs
A. Jennifer Clarke, Associate Provost for Campus Liaison
Maryann Corsetti, Director, Contract Development
Joseph DeFilippo, Assistant Provost for Academic Program Review and Planning
David DeMarco, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Resource and Systems Planning
Mary Edgerton, Senior Network Liaison Officer, Nylink
Larnell Flannagan, Associate for Research, Opportunity Programs
Teresa Foster, Associate for Data and Analysis, Institutional Research and Analysis
Caroline Forsberg, Director of Disability Services and Information, University Life
Eric Fredericksen, Assistant Provost for Advanced Learning Technology
Sharon Gallagher, Director, Academic Finance and Administration
John Ganio, Assistant Provost for Academic Program Review and Planning
William Gehring, Associate Provost for Campus Liaison
Wendy Gilman, Associate for University Financial Analysis
Robert Giuffrida, Project Staff Associate, Center for Academic and Workforce Development
Gladys Gould, Director of Student Life Programs, University Life
Christine Haile, Associate Provost for Technology Services
Carey Hatch, Assistant Provost for Library and Information Services
Robert James, Associate Provost for Opportunity Programs
Lynne Kraus, Senior Network Liaison Officer, Nylink
Robert Kraushaar, Associate Provost, Engineering and Technical Education
David Lamphere, Associate for Data and Analysis, Institutional Research and Analysis
Larry Levine, Senior Programmer Analyst, Nylink
Mary-Alice Lynch, Executive Director, Nylink
Deborah Aydt Marinelli, Project Administrative Officer, Diversity and Affirmative Action
Fred Matthews, Director, Financial Analysis for Health and Hospitals
Leslie Mayville, Interim Director, SUNY Training Center
Bruce McBride, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Public Safety
William Murabito, Associate Vice Chancellor, University Life/
    Executive Director, University Colleges of Technology
Laura Murray, Local Systems Implementation Specialist,
    Office of Library and Information Services
Tom Neiss, Associate Provost for Network Technology Services
Marion Newton, Director of Child Life Services, University Life
Michael Notarius, Associate Director, Information Technology Exchange Center
Marianna O'Dwyer, Associate Vice Chancellor, Office of the Chancellor
Jacqueline Davis Ohwevwo, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Diversity
    and Affirmative Action
Barbaraann Owad, Director of University Budget
Jon Penn, Senior Network Liaison Officer, Nylink
Jeffrey Perez, Director of Communication Services
Theodore Phelps, Director, Network Planning and Development
Peter Pileggi, Associate Provost for Hospital and Clinical Services
Steven Poskanzer, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Cynthia Proctor, Executive Assistant to the Provost
Catherine Regan, Associate for Data and Analysis, Institutional Research and Analysis
Peter Salins, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
John Schumacher, Senior Staff Assistant, Office of Library and Information Services
William Snyder, Executive Director, New York Network
Donald Steven, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs
Peter Thomas, Assistant Provost for Campus Liaison
Evelyn Ting, Director, Center for Learning and Technology, Empire State College
Kathryn Van Arnam, Assistant Provost for Academic Programs
Mission Review Stipend Committee

Steven Poskanzer, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, System Administration (Co-chair)
William Tully, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, College of Environmental Science and Forestry (Co-chair)
Walter Cohen, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, Cornell University
Jerome Feldman, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Research, College of Optometry
Ronald Gordon, Dean of the School of Ceramic Engineering and Materials Science, NYS College of Ceramics at Alfred University
Mark Karwan, Dean of the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, State University of New York at Buffalo
Lawrence B. Martin, Dean of the Graduate School, State University of New York at Stony Brook
Maxwell Mozell, Dean of the College of Graduate Studies, Health Science Center at Syracuse
Jeryl Mumpower, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of Graduate Studies, State University of New York at Albany
David Payne, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, State University of New York at Binghamton
Susan Schwartz-Giblin, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies, Health Science Center at Brooklyn

SUNY System Administration Staff
Elizabeth Bringsjord, Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs
Jennifer Clarke, Associate Provost for Campus Liaison
David M. DeMarco, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Resource and Systems Planning
Committee on Academic Program Review
Process Redesign 1999-2000

Charles Blaas, Vice President for Academic Affairs, College of Agriculture and Technology at Morrisville

Peter Brouer, Provost, College at Potsdam

Allen Eller, Assistant Provost, University at Binghamton

John Flynn, Vice President and Dean of Academic Affairs, Westchester Community College (Co-chair)

Judy Genshaft, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, University at Albany (until 7/1/00)

Jeryl Mumpower, Associate Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies, University at Albany (as of 7/6/00)

Patricia Pietropaolo, Dean of Academic Affairs, Herkimer County Community College

Donald Steven, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, System Administration (Co-chair)

Kathryn Van Arnam, Assistant Provost for Academic Programs, System Administration

Shirley VanMarter, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, Institute of Technology at Utica/Rome (until July 2000)

System Administration Staff

Elizabeth Bringsjord, Assistant Provost for Academic Affairs

Jennifer Clarke, Associate Provost for Campus Liaison

Joseph DeFilippo, Assistant Provost for Program Review and Planning

John Ganio, Assistant Provost for Program Review and Planning

William Gehring, Associate Provost for Campus Liaison

Lenora German, Staff Assistant

Robert Kraushaar, Associate Provost for Campus Liaison

Peter Pileggi, Associate Provost for Campus Liaison

Peter Thomas, Assistant Provost for Campus Liaison

Diane Dalto, Academic Affairs Fellow, System Administration (Summer 2000)

Paul Grover, Academic Affairs Fellow, System Administration (Summer 2000)
Provost’s Advisory Task Force on General Education

Co-chairs
Muriel A. Howard, President of State University College at Buffalo
Peter Salins, Provost and Vice Chancellor of the State University of New York

Campus Presidents
George Hamada, President of Rockland Community College
Shirley Strum Kenny, President of State University of New York at Stony Brook
Kenneth Wing, President of State University College of Agriculture and Technology at Cobleskill
Paul Yu, President of State University College at Brockport

Chief Academic Officers
Charles Blaas, Vice President for Academic Affairs, State University College of Agriculture and Technology at Morrisville
Barbara Dixon, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, State University College at Geneseo
Jonathan Gibralter, Dean of Academic Affairs, Corning Community College
Mary Ann Swain, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, State University of New York at Binghamton
Gary Waller, Vice President for Academic Affairs, State University College at Purchase

Faculty
Norman Goodman, Distinguished Service and Distinguished Teaching Professor, Department of Sociology, State University of New York at Stony Brook
George Higginbottom, Dean of Liberal Arts and Related Careers, Broome Community College
Marvin LaHood, Distinguished Teaching Professor, Department of English, State University College at Buffalo
Michael Murphy, Distinguished Teaching Professor, Department of Natural Sciences, State University College of Agriculture and Technology at Cobleskill
Miles Wolpin, Professor, Department of Politics, State University College at Potsdam

Students
Joanne Freeman, Fulton-Montgomery Community College
Naomi Long, State University College of Technology at Delhi

Staff Support
Ginette Chambers, Executive Assistant to the Provost
Anthony Chase, Assistant to the President, State University College at Buffalo
Joseph DeFilippo, Assistant Provost for Program Review and Planning
John Ganio, Assistant Provost for Program Review and Planning
Provost’s Advisory Council on General Education
2000-01

Richard Collier, Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Studies, University at Albany
M. Thomas Cooper, Professor of Visual and Performing Arts, Monroe Community College
Barbara Dixon, Vice President for Academic Affairs, SUNY College at Genesco (Co-Chair)

Sue Faerman, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, State University of New York at Albany
Jonathan Gibralter, Interim President, Corning Community College (Co-Chair)
Norman Goodman, Professor of Sociology, State University of New York at Stony Brook
Kerry Grant, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School, State University of New York at Buffalo
Paul Griffin, Dean, School of Liberal Arts, State University College of Agriculture and Technology at Morrisville
George H. Higginbottom, Dean of Liberal Arts and Related Careers, Broome Community College
Kathleen Lavoie, Dean, School of Arts and Sciences, SUNY College at Plattsburgh
Jennifer Lloyd, Director of Women’s Studies, SUNY College at Brockport
Cathleen McColgin, Director of Assessment, Cayuga County Community College
Una Mae Reck, Vice President for Academic Affairs, SUNY College at Fredonia
Rose Rudnitski, Associate Professor of Education, State University College at New Paltz
Gary Waller, Vice President for Academic Affairs, SUNY College at Purchase
Joseph G. DeFilippo, Assistant Provost for Program Review & Planning (System Liaison)

Patricia Pietropaolo, Interim Assistant Provost for Program Review and Planning (System Liaison)

December 27, 2000
Provo|st’s Advisory Council on Teacher Education

Julius Gregg Adams, Director of the School of Education, College at Fredonia
William Amoriell, Dean of the School of Education, College at Potsdam
Betsy Balzano, Distinguished Service Professor, Education, College at Brockport
Linda Biemer, Dean of the School of Education and Human Development (until 7/00), University at Binghamton
Christopher Dahl, President, College at Geneseo
Richard Hoffmann, Dean of Arts and Sciences, University at Albany
Donald Katt, President, Ulster County Community College
Hubert Keen, Special Assistant to the University Provost (Chair, ACTE)
Dan King, Dean of the Faculty of Applied Science and Education, College at Buffalo
David Lavallee, Provost, College at New Paltz
Judith Lloyd, Professor of Chemistry, Department Chair, College at Old Westbury
Michael Merilan, Dean of Science and Social Science, College at Oneonta
Suzanne Miller, Associate Dean of the Graduate School of Education, University at Buffalo
Galen Pletcher, Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences, College at Potsdam
John Presley, Provost, College at Oswego
Judson Taylor, President, College at Cortland
Paul Teske, Professor of Political Science, Graduate Program Director, University at Stony Brook
Kathleen Whittier, Professor of Education, College at Plattsburgh

SUNY System Administration Staff:
Ginette Chambers, Director of Faculty Awards and Development
Jennifer Clarke, Associate Provost for Campus Liaison
Kathryn Van Arnam, Assistant Provost for Academic Programs
SUNY Learning Network Advisory Board

Jeffrey Bartkovich, Vice President, Educational Technology Services, Monroe Community College
Raymond Cross, President, College of Agriculture and Technology at Morrisville
William Ferrero, Vice President for Administration, Empire State College
Eric Fredericksen, Assistant Provost for Advanced Learning Technology, State University of New York System Administration
Christine Haile, Associate Provost for Technology Services, State University of New York System Administration
Carl Haynes, President, Tompkins Cortland Community College
Voldemar Innus, Senior Associate Vice President, University Services, University at Buffalo
Donald Katt, President, Ulster County Community College
Joseph Kennedy, President, College of Technology at Canton
Steven Poskanzer, Vice Provost, State University of New York System Administration
Janet Potter, Director of Library Services, College at Oneonta
Carlos Santiago, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, University at Albany
Ronald Williams, President, Herkimer County Community College
Paul Yu, President, College at Brockport
Budget Allocation Methodology Committee Members

Campus Representatives
Georges E. Berube, Former Director of Business Affairs and Information Services, Canton
Ram L. Chugh, Distinguished Professor of Economics, Potsdam (representing University Faculty Senate)
John A. Falcone, Former Vice President for Administration, Utica-Rome
Nathan Fawcett, Director of Statutory College Affairs, Cornell (Co-Chair)
Leif S. Hartmark, Vice President for Finance and Administration, Oneonta
Voldemar A. Innus, Senior Associate Vice President for University Services, Buffalo Center
Stanley Kardonsky, Vice President for Finance and Management, Buffalo State College
Thomas Leamer, Former Vice President for Academic Affairs, Morrisville
Ivan M. Lisnitzer, Senior Vice President for Administration, Health Science Center at Brooklyn (Co-Chair)
E. Thomas Moran, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Plattsburgh
Rollin C. Richmond, Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs, Stony Brook
Michael A. Scullard, Vice President for Administration, Binghamton
Barbara P. Sirvis, Former Vice President for Academic Affairs, Brockport (Co-Chair)
Mary Ann Swain, Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs, Binghamton (Co-Chair)
William P. Tully, Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs, Environmental Science and Forestry

System Administration Support
Tommy Annas, Assistant Provost for Institutional Research
Gary L. Blose, Associate for University Financial Analysis
David M. DeMarco, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Finance and Management
Wendy C. Gilman, Associate for University Financial Analysis
Sherwin L. Iverson, Former Assistant Provost, Academic Planning, Policy & Evaluation
William Messner, Former Vice Provost
Barbaraann H. Owad, Director of University Budget
Charles A. Thompson, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Finance and Management
Kathryn VanArnam, Assistant Provost, Academic Planning, Policy & Evaluation