Memorandum to Presidents

Date: August 8, 1973

From: Office of the Associate Chancellor for Policy and Planning

Subject: Regents' Planning Bulletin for 1974 Progress Report

According to the master planning provisions of the Education Law, the University is required to formulate a consolidated 1974 Progress Report and Interim Revision of the Master Plan of 1972 for submission to the Regents by June 1, 1974. Enclosed you will find a copy of the Regents' 1974 Progress Report Bulletin which we've just received. This Bulletin constitutes the formal request for preparation of the Progress Report from the Regents to the Trustees of State University, who have the responsibility for communicating planning information to the Regents.

The University as a whole and the campuses have been through a thorough planning process in connection with the 1972 Master Plan. At this date, the Office of Policy and Planning has not yet made a recommendation, or designed an internal planning process, for the formulation of the University's 1974 Progress Report. However, as usual, any statistical information or other quantitative data pertaining to the campuses that may be made part of the University's 1974 submission will be requested and coordinated through the central staff Office of Institutional Research.

As soon as a determination has been made about a 1974 planning process, we will, of course, be in touch with you again.

Charles W. Ingler

Enclosure

cc: Chancellor Boyer
Memorandum to Presidents
August 8, 1973

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

Copies for information only sent to:
  Chancellor Kibbee
  Dean McGrath
  Vice Provost Risley
  President Miles
July 9, 1973

MEMORANDUM TO
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS OF
INSTITUTIONS OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
IN NEW YORK STATE

I am happy to transmit to you the enclosed copy of The Regents 1974 Progress Report Bulletin. The Regents are optimistic that this Bulletin will prove useful to you as you prepare your Progress Reports for submission to them in the Spring of 1974.

Sincerely,

T. Edward Hollander
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EXECUTIVE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
   Gordon M. Ambach

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FOR HIGHER AND PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION
   T. Edward Hollander
The Regents 1974 Progress Report Bulletin is designed to encourage continuous planning in all institutions in the State. While institutions are asked to address themselves to the goals and objectives which the Regents have set forth for the State as a whole, each institution should carefully define its own mission and purpose and the contribution it can make to the State's overall system of post-secondary education.

The Bulletin suggests the framework progress reports should take and asks each institution to review its 1972 Master Plan, to consider the Regents response to it, and to replan where appropriate. Institutions will be assisted in this replanning effort by the questions posed in this Bulletin, as the questions deal with those areas of special concern to the Regents.

Joseph W. McGovern
Chancellor of the Board of Regents
The Regents 1974 Progress Report Bulletin is intended to encourage a further exchange of ideas within and among institutions in order to promote a clearer understanding of the nature and ends of education beyond high school in New York State. The Bulletin is designed to help each institution achieve maximum effectiveness in terms of its goals and objectives within the overall system of postsecondary education.

In reviewing its 1972 Master Plan, each institution should seek to build upon existing strengths and uncover and repair present weaknesses. Each institution should ask whether its previously stated objectives remain appropriate in a time of rapid change, whether all programs and activities are consistent with the objectives, and whether the resources will be available to achieve all of the desired goals.

The real significance of such a review is its power to stimulate, organize and give objectivity to the kind of self-criticism and internal constructive planning which lead to better understanding, broader vision, sounder teaching and more informed educational policy.

We look forward to your contributions to the 1974 Progress Report and stand ready to assist you in any way.

Ewald B. Nyquist
President of The University of the State of New York and Commissioner of Education
PURPOSE

The purpose of this bulletin is to assist each institution as it reexamines its own 1972 Master Plan and formulates its progress report for submission to the Regents in 1974. The content is designed to suggest the general format the report should take and to identify for the institution those areas of special concern to the Regents. The Regents recognize that while these concerns are of primary importance to the Regents, they are not necessarily of primary importance to the institution. Thus each institution is encouraged to place particular emphasis on those issues and matters which are of primary import to the institution’s future and well-being. The Regents trust that this bulletin will (1) encourage a continuing planning process in all institutions and (2) provide the structure for dialogue among the Regents and all institutions in the State.

PROCEDURE

Each institution in the State that offers some form of advanced academic or professional education, whether it be of a collegiate or noncollegiate nature, is asked to participate in the planning process. This participation will be accomplished in the following way:

- All State-operated units of the State University of New York (SUNY) will submit individual progress reports to the SUNY central staff. All community colleges will submit two copies of their progress reports to SUNY central staff and two information copies to the Office of Planning in Higher Education, State Education Department. The trustees of SUNY will submit to the Regents on June 1, 1974 a consolidated progress report covering the activities of all SUNY programs and units with special reference to (a) matters of importance
to the University in the implementation of its 1972 Master Plan, and
a reassessment of the recommendations contained in State University's
Master Plan as acted on by the Regents, and (b) progress made toward
the Regents goals as measured by the questions contained in this
bulletin. Campus-by-campus data, requested in the schedules contained
in this bulletin, will be made available as part of the progress report
or separately submitted as supporting information at the option of the
State University on or before June 1, 1974.

The Board of Higher Education of New York will submit to the Regents
on June 1, 1974 a composite progress report for The City University
of New York (CUNY) covering the activities of all of CUNY's programs
and units with special reference to (a) all matters of importance
to the University in the implementation of its 1972 Master Plan, and
a reassessment of the recommendations contained in City University's
Master Plan as acted on by the Regents, and (b) progress made toward
the Regents goals as measured by the questions contained in this
bulletin. Campus-by-campus data, requested in the schedules contained
in this bulletin, will be made available as part of the progress report
or separately submitted as supporting information at the option of the
City University on or before June 1, 1974.

All private colleges that are members of the Commission on Independent
Colleges and Universities will submit two copies of their progress
reports to the President of the Commission and two information copies
to the Office of Planning in Higher Education, State Education
Department. The President of the Commission will summarize the
reports he receives and transmit them to the Regents on June 1, 1974
as a single document. This document will show the progress that
the private colleges are making on (a) all matters of importance to
the Commission in the implementation of its 1972 Plan, and a reassessment of the recommendations contained in the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities' Master Plan, as acted on by the Regents, and (b) the Regents goals as measured by the questions contained in this bulletin.

--- All private colleges and universities that are not members of the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities will submit their progress reports to the Deputy Commissioner for Higher and Professional Education on or before March 1, 1974.

--- Those specialized institutions, not chartered as colleges, but which grant degrees in specific programs (several of which submitted 1972 Master Plans) will submit their progress reports to the Deputy Commissioner for Higher and Professional Education on or before March 1, 1974.

--- All institutions licensed under Section 5001 or registered under the provisions of Section 5002 of the education law, choosing to comply with the Regents request, will submit their plans to the Deputy Commissioner for Higher and Professional Education on or before March 1, 1974.

The composite progress reports and plans of both collegiate and noncollegiate institutions, along with any amendments the Regents make to their own 1972 Statewide Plan, will form the Regents 1974 Progress Report. This Progress Report will be submitted to the Governor for review and approval not later than November 1, 1974.

CONTENT OF THE REPORT

Progress reports submitted by institutions should be divided into two parts. In the first part, Part I, each institution should consider what
progress it has made toward those goals and objectives it set for itself in its 1972 Master Plan. The institution should also reassess its 1972 recommendations which were acted upon by the Regents in their 1972 Statewide Plan. Each institution should emphasize its unique and distinctive character, as diversity among institutions is highly desirable. Here is essentially the place where each institution can replan, in light of changes which may have occurred since it issued its 1972 Master Plan, and make any amendments, changes, or additions it finds desirable.

Replanning should include, but not be limited to, any alterations an institution wishes to make in the following planning areas:

1. **Mission, goals and/or objectives.** Each institution should rethink its mission, goals and/or objectives, analyzing the specific, unique character of its institution and what it can and should contribute to the overall educational structure, the local community, the State, the nation and the world. Institutions should emphasize their diversity, as no single institution need be all things to all men.

2. **Admissions Policies.** If an institution has altered its admissions policies, it should explain its reasons and the effect this alteration has had on institutional enrollment, quality, faculty workload, etc.

3. **Enrollment Goals.** If an institution has new projected enrollment goals that may result from additional input, this is the time to reassess the goals presented in its 1972 Master Plan and present new goals and accompanying rationales for Regents consideration.

4. **Academic Programs.** If an institution is considering the addition or deletion of any academic program, this information should be shared with the Regents in the institution's 1974 Progress Report. The fact that an institution mentions in its report that it is considering adding
a program does not in any way imply that the Regents have approved or
disapproved that program, just as no institution is bound to actually
offer a program it mentions in the 1974 Progress Report. This inclusion
of a considered program is for planning purposes only and institutions
should continue to submit their requests for program registration to
the Department when and if they decide to implement a considered program.

5. **Facilities Construction and Utilization Plans.** Plans to add,
rent or sell significant physical facilities should be mentioned in the
1974 Progress Report. The Regents view the improved utilization of all
physical facilities as one way to cut educational costs.

6. **Resource Allocation Policies.** It is useful for the Regents to
know the priorities an institution assigns to the various components
within its purview in order to better assess the effective allocation
of resources. Those components include, but are not limited to, fiscal
resources, physical facilities, faculty resources, library resources,
and administrative resources.

7. **Research.** This activity is essential to the concept of a total
educational picture. Not all schools need sponsored research projects,
but it is necessary for New York State as a totality to do its share to
further the development of new knowledge. On the other hand, self-
assessment, research and evaluation enhance the relevance of institutional
instruction.

8. **Public Service.** Each institution, once it has defined its mission
and purpose, has assumed a certain role and responsibility in the local
community, the State, the nation and the world. An institution should
strive to integrate its educational purpose and programs with the needs
of the community.
9. **New Developments.** Any innovative ideas which an institution has developed which were not appropriate for inclusion in any of the above categories can be included here. Additionally, if an institution has solved any of its problems, since its 1972 Master Plan, and thinks its resolution could be useful for other institutions which may be encountering similar difficulties, an institution is requested to share this information.

In summation, Part I will reflect the primary concerns of each institution, with emphasis placed on each institution's unique and distinctive contribution to higher education in the State.

Conversely, Part II will reflect those concerns of special interest to the Regents as coordinator of all institutions into one comprehensive system of post-secondary education for the State. Just as the viewpoints necessarily differ, so do the concerns. Thus, the Regents concerns focus on the Regents objectives based upon those goals for post-secondary education set forth in their April 1971 planning bulletin *Education Beyond High School* and reiterated in their 1972 Statewide Plan. Those goals are:

1. **Equalization of Educational Opportunities**
   
   An equalized opportunity for entry into post-secondary education for all those who are high school graduates or those possessing equivalent experience.

2. **A Comprehensive System of Post-Secondary Education**

   A range of post-secondary education institutions and agencies sufficient in number and diversity to provide the levels, types, and quality of academic and professional programs which will meet the requirements of those who wish to participate in such programs.

3. **Excellence in the Pursuit of Knowledge**

   A post-secondary educational system that supports an atmosphere of inquiry conducive to the systematic search for knowledge and a quality of achievement of the highest caliber in whatever area studied.
4. Meeting the Educational Needs of Society

A meshing of the students' aspirations and abilities for post-secondary education, the availability of academic and professional programs, and the needs of society as manifested by career opportunities.

5. A System Responsive to Community Needs

An integration of the capabilities of post-secondary education with the needs and aspirations of the communities in which the particular institution exists.

Regents objectives have been derived from these goals. The following questions, with appropriate data schedules, are designed to assess the progress made to date by each institution as it joins with the Regents in moving toward the Regents objectives for the seventies. Each question has been carefully considered and evaluated by the staff of the Education Department before inclusion in this document.

In order that the intent of each question asked by the Regents be clarified, a rationale has been provided. The rationale attempts to clarify the goal and objective of the question, defines the data elements being requested, and informs the institution of the utilization planned for the data requested. The final part of the rationale is a brief discussion of the Regents policy issue which prompted the asking of the question. The rationale will follow the question for easy reference.

Should an institution encounter difficulty with specific questions which follow, it should feel free to provide a complete explanation of the reasons for the difficulty and the institution's position on the question involved. The Regents repeat that their concern is statewide, and that they, in no way, expect or want any institution to serve all of these specific objectives.

When reference is made to data schedules in the following questions, it is done so for graphic amplification of the question, not solely as a
request for the completion of a data collection form. The schedules provide the background data upon which responses should be based, but an interpretation of the data is also invited. In addition to providing campus-by-campus data, it is also desirable for the three units, namely the State University, the City University, and the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities, to submit aggregated schedules for their respective sectors for each schedule in the bulletin. The groupings to be followed by the three sectors are:

By the State University of New York:
- University Centers
- University Colleges
- Health Sciences Centers
- Specialized Colleges
- Statutory Colleges
- Two-Year Colleges
  - Agricultural and Technical Colleges
  - Community Colleges
  - Community Colleges sponsored by the Board of Higher Education in New York City

By The City University of New York:
- Graduate Center
- Senior Colleges

By the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities:
- Multiversities
- Universities
- College Complexes
- Colleges
- Engineering and Technical Schools
- Specialized Colleges
- Health Centers
- Seminaries and Religious Training Schools
- Two-Year Schools
  - General
  - Specialized

Thus the following questions represent those areas of special concern to the Regents and are grouped within the Regents goals:

*The Classification System to be used to determine the appropriate group for each institution can be found in Appendix A, page 61.
GOAL NO. 1 EQUALIZATION OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

1. To measure the progress institutions are making toward the Regents goal of equalized educational opportunity, in both regular and opportunity programs,* without regard to race, sex or national origin, the Regents ask each institution to describe and project its first-time, full-time undergraduate student population by sex, ethnic identity and program category for the years 1972-1974.1 In addition, each institution should describe its student recruitment and admissions policies and practices that are aimed at meeting the requirements of Federal and State equal opportunity mandates.

Schedule 1, First-Time, Full-Time Undergraduate Students by Sex, Ethnic Identity, and Program Type, 1972 and 1973; Estimated Data, 1974.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment by Classification²</th>
<th>Fall 1972</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Fall 1972</th>
<th>Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total First-Time, Full-Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Students³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-Surnamed American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Full-Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Opportunity programs include: SEEK, College Discovery, EOP, and HEOP.

NOTE: See p.10 for list of footnotes.
List of Footnotes for Schedule 1

1. The Regents are fully cognizant of the difficulties involved in meeting the data requirements of Schedule 1. The data are, however, necessary to measure the quantitative impact of Regents policy statements on the post-secondary community, and to project future resource requirements (e.g., student aid) necessary to continue the commitment to equal opportunity.

2. The ethnic groups indicated are consistent with those defined in the "Compliance Report of Institutions of Higher Education, Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, (Fall 1972);" Form No. OS-34; issued by the Office of Civil Rights in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW). These ethnic groups are: American Indian, Negro (Black), Oriental, Spanish-Surnamed American, and All Other.

3. The definition of first-time, full-time undergraduate students is consistent with the definition provided on form NYSED 2.3 of the Higher Education Data System: "New students not previously enrolled in your institution or in any institution of higher education. Include students admitted under Advance Credit or Advance Placement plans (who received some credits through examinations, test scores, etc.). Exclude transfer students and students who were enrolled in summer programs."

---

Rationale for Question #1 and accompanying Schedule #1

**Goal:** Equalization of educational opportunity

**Objective:** To measure the progress institutions are making toward the Regents goal of equalized educational opportunity in both regular and special opportunity programs and to assure that this progress is made without regard to race, sex, or national origin.

**Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned**

First-time, full-time undergraduate students
- By sex
- By ethnic identity
- By program type (special opportunity program or regular program)
- Actual data for all 1972 and 1973 and estimated data for 1974

The data will be examined to observe trends in the number of minority group members admitted to regular undergraduate programs as well as to special opportunity programs. The data will also be reviewed to determine trends in the sex profile of the undergraduate student population, especially in light of Regents Statewide Plan recommendations and projections.

**At issue:** In May 1972 the Regents issued a Position Paper 15 entitled Minority Access To and Participation in Post Secondary Education in which much concern was stated concerning the unfortunate segregation of minority group students in special opportunity programs. At that time the Regents stated: "Equal opportunity must come to mean integration of all the facets of programs in higher education, including and especially REGULAR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS." In addition, the Regents stated in their 1972 Statewide Plan that they expect the 1980 full-time undergraduate enrollment population to be equally distributed between the sexes. This question speaks to these Regents concerns.
2. Equalization of educational opportunity must extend to all levels of the post-secondary educational enterprise. For the faculty to be as diverse as the population it serves and to assure a reasonable ratio between tenured and non-tenured faculty, the Regents ask: What steps has each institution taken to assure that recruitment and promotion policies result in larger numbers of qualified women and minority group members being channeled into the college teaching profession? Utilizing the schedules below, provide data that will show the changes in numbers and percents of these groups. In addition, the Regents request that each institution report the progress it has made toward the hiring of qualified experienced practitioners as faculty members.*


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual Data (Fall)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Full-Time Faculty</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Full-Time Faculty in Tenure-Bearing Titles  
   a. Tenured 
   b. Non-Tenured 

2. Full-Time Faculty in Non-Tenure-Bearing Titles

*Experienced practitioners are those people qualified by long years in a trade, business, museum or other cultural institution who have been closed out of the educational enterprise because they lack the "credentials" prerequisite to teach in an institution of higher education. (See p. 121 of the Regents 1972 Statewide Plan).

NOTE: See p. 14 for list of footnotes.
Schedule 2b, Full-Time Faculty by Sex, Distributed According to Tenure-Bearing Titles and Non-Tenure Bearing Titles for the Years 1970-1973.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Faculty</th>
<th>1970 Fall</th>
<th>1971 Fall</th>
<th>1972 Fall</th>
<th>1973 Fall</th>
<th>Increase 1970-73</th>
<th>Percent Increase 1970-73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Bearing Titles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Bearing Titles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Bearing Titles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Bearing Titles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Bearing Titles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Bearing Titles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: See p. 14 for list of footnotes.
Schedule 2c, Full-Time Faculty by Ethnic Identity, Distributed According to Tenure-Bearing Titles and Non-Tenure Bearing Titles for the Years 1970-1973.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Faculty</th>
<th>Fall 1970</th>
<th>Fall 1971</th>
<th>Fall 1972</th>
<th>Fall 1973</th>
<th>Increase 1970-73</th>
<th>Percent Increase 1970-73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Bearing Titles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Bearing Titles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

American Indian
- Tenure-Bearing Titles
- Non-Tenure Bearing Titles

Black
- Tenure-Bearing Titles
- Non-Tenure Bearing Titles

Oriental
- Tenure-Bearing Titles
- Non-Tenure Bearing Titles

Spanish-Surnamed American
- Tenure-Bearing Titles
- Non-Tenure Bearing Titles

All Other Full-Time Faculty
- Tenure-Bearing Titles
- Non-Tenure Bearing Titles

NOTE: See p. 14 for list of footnotes.
List of Footnotes for Schedules 2a, 2b, and 2c

1. Faculty is defined as: "The body of persons to whom instruction responsibilities of the institutions are entrusted." A normal full-time load is defined as: "the number of credit hours or clock hours that the institution considers to be a full-time load." [Source: Higher Education Faculty and Staff Assignment Classification Manual, Preliminary Field Review Edition, Technical Report 18, the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE, 1971, pp. 98-99].

Include 9-10 month and 11-12 month faculty, and any other contract faculty.

2. Tenure-bearing titles are distinguished from non-tenure bearing titles in this way: the former represents those positions in the staffing structure which are tenured or which are a part of the promotional pyramid which leads to tenure, whereas those titles in the latter category are not. Examples of non-tenure bearing titles are: lecturer and research associate. [Sources: NCHEMS Manual cited above, p. 102, and Higher Education Guidelines, Executive Order 1226, Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Civil Rights, 1972, p. 9].

Rationale for Question #2 and accompanying Schedules 2a, 2b, and 2c

Goal: Equalization of educational opportunity

Objective: To insure the diversity of faculty manifested by increased numbers of women and members of minority groups and to insure that these two groups are in faculty positions that lead to tenure.

Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned

Full-time Faculty

To observe trends in total tenured faculty and the numbers of women and minority group members that are in faculty positions which lead to tenure.

At issue:

1. In May 1972 the Regents Position Paper #15, Minority Access To and Participation in Post-Secondary Education, was issued, in which the Regents encouraged institutions to reassess the procedures used in faculty recruitment from these groups. This same concern was reiterated in the 1972 Statewide Plan.
2. In April 1972 the Regents Position Paper #14, *Equal Opportunity for Women*, was issued, in which the Regents joined with the Federal government in the requirement that "Governing boards and executive officers of all New York educational institutions should develop, if they have not already done so, affirmative action plans, including realistic numerical goals and timetables, for the recruitment and promotion of women in professional and managerial positions." This same concern was reiterated in the 1972 Statewide Plan. This question and the accompanying schedules speak to these Regents concerns.

3. At the same time, the Regents are concerned that some institutions may be placing themselves in potentially untenable positions because of an imbalance in the numbers of tenured and non-tenured faculty. Institutions are urged to examine, on a department-by-department level, the tenure status and age of each incumbent to avoid developing future crises.
3. The major remaining barrier to equal access to post-secondary education is the lack of sufficient financial means to attend an institution. The use of tuition waivers has historically been an effective means of removing this barrier. For the Regents to adequately evaluate the impact of the financial crisis on student access to higher education, the Regents ask that institutions show Student Aid Revenues by source and Student Aid Expenditures for fiscal 1969-70 through 1972-73. For each year, show the percentage of selected Educational and General Revenues represented by unfunded Student Aid, as well as the total number of student aid recipients and the average student aid award.

Schedule 3, Student Aid Revenues by Source, Student Aid Expenditures, and Unfunded Student Aid as a Percent of Selected Educational and General Revenues, Fiscal 1969-70 through 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student Aid Revenues¹ ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Direct Grants for Student Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Restricted Funds for Support of Sponsored Research Student Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Gifts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Endowment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student Aid Expenditures² ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unfunded Student Aid³ ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Selected Education and General Revenues⁴ ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unfunded Student Aid/Selected Education and General Revenues (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Total Number of Student Aid Recipients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Average Student Aid Award ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: See p.18 for list of footnotes.
Footnotes for Schedule 3

1. Student Aid Revenues are the total amount of restricted funds received during the fiscal period for scholarships, fellowships, grants-in-aid and prizes and awards. (Source of definition: College and University Business Administration, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. 1968, pp. 193-194.)

2. Student Aid Expenditures include direct aid grants and scholarships to students; and the remission of, or exemption from payment of, tuition and fees. Exclude those grants, remissions, and exemptions granted because of faculty or other staff status; and also exclude those scholarship expenses where service is required of students. (Source of definition: Ibid. pp. 198-199.)

3. Unfunded Student Aid equals Student Aid Expenditures less Student Aid Revenues.

4. Exclude revenues for: Sponsored Research, Other Separately Budgeted Research, Other Sponsored Programs, Organized Activities Related to Educational Departments and Recovery of Indirect Costs. (Note that restricted funds for support of students engaged in Federally-sponsored research arc to bo included in Student Aid Revenues in the above schedule.)

Rationale for Question #3 and accompanying Schedule 3

Goal: Equalization of educational opportunity

Objective: To determine the impact of the recent financial crisis on student access to higher education.

Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned

- Student Aid Revenues, by source
- Student Aid Expenditures
- Unfunded Student Aid
- Selected Education and General Revenues
- Unfunded Student Aid as a Percent of Educational and General Revenues
- Total Number of Student Aid Recipients
- Average Student Aid Award

An inflated percentage of unfunded student aid/selected education and general revenues signals an institution in financial trouble. These data requested above would provide information on the student aid trend within an institution and would provide indicators of the fiscal impact that the policy of equal access has had on the institution. The Office of Higher Education Management Services may be consulted with and recommendations offered as to other ways to effect economies.

At issue: The use of tuition waivers has historically been an effective means of removing one of the main barriers to equal access to post-secondary education—the lack of sufficient financial means to attend an institution of higher education. The Regents need to be able to monitor closely the impact of the financial crisis in education on equal access to post-secondary education. This request for data on unfunded student aid and average student aid awards is necessary for that evaluation.
4. The Regents have become increasingly concerned about the rapidly rising increases in the cost of attendance. They recognize that although tuition frequently is the largest single direct cost to the student, costs may be increased in other ways. Because the Regents wish to examine tuition and other costs of attendance and to minimize the burden on students, they ask each institution to describe its policy on pricing. Specifically, in order to meet expenditures, has an institution been required to increase student charges for tuition, fees, room, or board? Use the schedule below and explain significant increases.

Schedule 4, Undergraduate Student Charges; Actual Data, 1970-71 through 1974-75; Projected Data 1975-76, 1980-81.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Charge</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergraduate Charges$1 ($)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Please indicate the academic year charges for full-time in-state students only. If the projections for "Total Undergraduate Charges" shown here are different from the projections contained in the institution's 1972 master plan, please restate the 1972 master plan projections and explain the conditions that led to the changed projections.
Rationale for Question #4 and accompanying Schedule #4

Goal: Equalization of education opportunity

Objective: To assure the availability of post-secondary education to all segments of the population, regardless of economic status, the Regents need to examine periodically those charges for post-secondary educational services which accrue directly to the student to make certain that low-income students are not priced out of the education market.

Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned

Undergraduate Student Charges.
- Tuition
- Required Fees
- Room
- Board
- Other

Actual data for the years 1970-71 through 1974-75 and projected data for 1975-76 and 1980-81 for the foregoing data elements are requested.

These data will be compared with the institution's overall Education and General Costs per full-time equivalent student as well as with the cost of living index published by the New York State Department of Commerce to identify trends.

At issue: The Regents have become increasingly concerned that the rapidly rising increases in the cost of attendance at post-secondary institutions in the State could pose an insurmountable barrier to the pursuit of post-secondary education by those students in low- and middle-income groups. For this reason, the Regents believe it to be desirable for the institution to examine and analyze the student costs for education periodically.
GOAL NO. II. A COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

5. In the 1972 Statewide Plan, the Regents stated that all persons in the State, regardless of age, should have the opportunity to avail themselves of some form of post-secondary education. This opportunity depends on ease of entry to institutions and reentry among institutions. The Regents recognize that the barriers to flexible entry and reentry opportunities include:

a. The dearth of preferential readmittance policies for students who "drop out" for a period of time;

b. The inflexible time limitation imposed on transfer students wishing to transfer credits from past academic achievement; and

c. The imposed time of degree completion. (This refers to the policy which requires completion of degree course requirements within a specified time period.)

The Regents, therefore, ask each institution to describe specific changes in its admissions policies which have been enacted in the past 3 years (1970-71 through 1972-73) to overcome these barriers.

PROVIDE NARRATIVE RESPONSE

* * *

Rationale for Question #5

Goal: A comprehensive system of post-secondary education

Objective: To make certain that institutions have altered their admissions policies to accommodate those students of any age whose principal barrier to the pursuit of higher education has been inflexibility in the entry and reentry policies of the post-secondary institutions in the State.

Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned

This information does not lend itself easily to tabulation, but the Regents have asked that each institution describe specific changes in its admissions policies that speak to this issue. Include changes enacted in the past three years (1970-71 through 1972-73). These changes will be evaluated for their responsiveness to the above objective.

At issue: The Regents in their 1972 Statewide Plan for the Development of Post-Secondary Education have stated as one of their specific objectives -- "Flexible admissions criteria for easier entry and reentry into and among post-secondary institutions." This objective was manifested in a number of recommendations in the plan as well. This question is designed as a follow-up to gauge institutional response to this Regents objective.
6. To increase articulation between secondary and post-secondary sectors of education and to increase options for qualified students, the Regents have recommended the careful development of time-shortened baccalaureate degree programs. To this end, the Regents ask each institution if it has established (or plans to establish) any time-shortened programs. If so, each institution is to:

a. Show how many students were registered annually in each of the time-shortened degree programs described below in Schedule 5.

b. Enumerate the academic field(s) in which time-shortened degrees are offered and describe the general characteristics of each program.

c. Describe plans for future time-shortened baccalaureate degree programs; include planned schedule of implementation.

Schedule 5, Admissions into Time-Shortened Baccalaureate Degree Programs for the Years 1971-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Fall 1971</th>
<th>Fall 1972</th>
<th>Fall 1973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Applicants Accepted and Registered in Time-Shortened Baccalaureate Degree Programs

a. Number of new students registered in programs which provide college entrance into regular curricula for students who have not completed high school diploma requirements (i.e., high school juniors).

b. Number of new students registered in programs which provide college entrance into special programs for students who have not completed high school diploma requirements.

c. Number of new students registered in time-and/or credit-shortened college programs (e.g., 90-credit-hour baccalaureate) for high school graduates.

d. Number of new students registered in other time option arrangements.
Rationale for Question #6 and accompanying Schedule 5

Goal: A comprehensive system of post-secondary education

Objective: To assess to what degree the institutions have established, or plan to establish, time-shortened baccalaureate degree programs as one way to increase articulation between secondary and post-secondary sectors of education.

Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned

Total number of applicants accepted and registered in 1971, 1972, and 1973 in time-shortened baccalaureate degree programs by each institution and by type of program. Elaboration as to the type of program and the academic field involved is encouraged.

These data will be reviewed to determine the nature and extent of the institutional response to the Regents call for the careful development of such programs.

At issue: As a part of the Regents commitment to a comprehensive system of post-secondary education, the Regents have urged institutions to "increase student options...and to consider the careful development of 3-year curricular options for qualified students in appropriate fields." This question speaks to this issue.
7. The development and implementation of a comprehensive system of post-secondary education requires the maximum utilization of every resource available, especially physical facilities. In this regard the Regents ask the following:

a. In the case of the private sector and State University, where physical facilities appear to be ample at this time, the Regents want to know what cooperative steps these two sectors have taken to improve the space utilization of their facilities, before any new facilities are planned.

b. At the City University, where physical facilities appear to be less than ample, what cooperative steps have been taken to utilize existing facilities within other sectors?

c. To allow for changes in projected facilities needs resulting from improved utilization, completion of construction projects, and alterations in institutional programs, the Regents want to know of any modification an institution wishes to make to the facilities' projections contained in its 1972 master plan. Rationales should be provided for the revised projections. (Use Schedule 6 below.)

Schedule 6, Total Physical Facilities, Actual and Projected Data, 1972-80.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th></th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 1972</td>
<td>Fall 1973</td>
<td>Fall 1974</td>
<td>Fall 1975</td>
<td>Fall 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Square Feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Assignable Sq. Feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I &amp; R Depts./Org.Activ./Org.Rsrch./Pub.Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Services Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Institutional Agencies Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assignable Sq. Feet per FTE Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. NOTE: See p. 26 for list of footnotes.
Footnotes for Schedule 6

1. If the projections for “Total Gross Square Feet” shown here are different from the projections contained in the institution’s 1972 master plan, please restate the 1972 master plan projections and explain the conditions that led to the changed projections.


3. Enrollment:
   a. Degree-credit enrollment is defined as: "Students in a program or taking courses that carry credit toward an associate, bachelor’s or higher degree or advanced certificate. Students in programs such as organized occupational programs leading to a certificate, diploma, or other formal award should be considered degree-credit for the purposes of this report even though the program is terminal and designed for immediate employment."
   b. To allow comparability of data, the Education Department is currently developing a set of formulae defining Full-time Equivalent Enrollment by level. A supplemental document containing these formulae will be mailed later in the summer of 1973.

Rationale for Question #7 and accompanying Schedule 6

Goal: A comprehensive system of post-secondary education

Objective: To assess the degree to which cooperative utilization of physical facilities resources is evident and to assess the degree to which institutions have improved, or plan to improve, the utilization of their facilities.

Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned

- Total gross square feet
- Total net square feet (by type of organizational unit)
- Full-time equivalent enrollment
- Net assignable square feet/full-time equivalent student

These data are needed to examine the availability of space projected in all sectors of post-secondary education in the State, to examine the projected student population, and to analyze the resulting expected space utilization rates.

At issue: The Regents in their 1972 Statewide Plan for the Development of Post-Secondary Education, expressed their dissatisfaction with the capital development projections of some of the sectors. Thus the Regents recommended that the sectors investigate various methods of increasing the utilization of present space. These data are necessary to determine the extent to which the institutions have made any progress in this area.
8. The Regents predicated their proposal for "Financing Collegiate Post-Secondary Education in the Seventies" (1972 Regents Statewide Plan, pp. 171-200) on certain assumed factors. Factor "5b" (p. 190) assumed "An annual inflation rate of 3.5 percent." In addition, factor "5c" (p. 191) postulated "Increased efficiency throughout the higher education system, especially in 4-year institutions where increases in productivity of 1 percent annually are expected. The net result of this approach will be a reduction in the cost per student in terms of constant 1972 dollars." Therefore, the Regents ask each institution to assess how much its Educational and General (E&G) Expenditures for Instruction and Departmental Research, Extension and Public Service, Libraries, Student Services, Operation and Maintenance of Physical Plant, General Administration and General Institutional purposes (as defined in AEGIS) and the corresponding E&G Expenditures per FTE student increased between fiscal 1970-71 and fiscal 1972-73. As a part of the response to this question please complete schedules 7 and 8.

Schedule 7, Selected Education and General Expenditures for the Years 1971-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Selected Education and General Expenditures (1) ($)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction and Departmental Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension and Public Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and Maintenance of Physical Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Education and General Expenditures per FTE Student (1) ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Unit expenditures for: Sponsored Research, Other Separately Budgeted Research, Other Sponsored Programs, Organized Activities Related to Educational Departments.

2. Should include Staff Benefits.

3. Utilize data from Schedules 7 and 8 to compute "Selected Education and General Expenditures per FTE Student."
Rationale for Question #8 and accompanying Schedules 7 and 8

**Goal:** A comprehensive system of post-secondary education

**Objective:** To assess the impact of the Regents proposals for increased fiscal accountability on the expenditures of institutions

**Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned**

Schedule 7 asks for specific Education and General Expenditures, delineated by purposes, with the corresponding E&G Expenditures per FTE student for three fiscal years.

Schedule 8 asks for full-time equivalent degree credit enrollment for the fall of 1970, 1971, and 1972, by undergraduate, graduate (master's and doctoral), and first professional levels.

Data from Schedules 7 and 8 will be used to examine educational costs per student to judge responsiveness to the Regents financial proposals in the 1972 Statewide Plan. The breakout, by purpose and by level of expenditure, will allow the Regents to identify those components responsible for unusual fluctuations in the per student costs to the institution.

**At issue:** For the State to be justified in its continued financial support of post-secondary education, it is essential that institutions and the Regents examine the components of, and factors affecting, costs of education and propose ways to improve resource utilization.
Schedule 8, Full-Time Equivalent Degree Credit Enrollment, Fall 1970-72.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Enrollment</th>
<th>Fall 1970</th>
<th>Fall 1971</th>
<th>Fall 1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Degree Credit Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate FTE Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate FTE Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Professional FTE Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Degree-credit enrollment is defined as: "Students in a program or taking courses that carry credit toward an associate, bachelor's or higher degree or advanced certificate. Students in programs such as organized occupational programs leading to a certificate, diploma, or other formal award should be considered degree-credit for the purposes of this report even though the program is terminal and designed for immediate employment."

To allow comparability of data, the Education Department is currently developing a set of formulae defining Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment by level. A supplemental document containing these formulae will be mailed later in the summer of 1973.
There has been concern for many years that philanthropy was too heavily oriented toward specific purposes; e.g., buildings, endowed chairs, particular collections, etc., and that these funds were not available for current operations. Also, in the late sixties, contributions severely declined after the era of student unrest, and this was compounded by an economic recession. In the hope that these were transient phenomena, the Regents ask that each institution show its revenue from Gifts and Grants for fiscal 1969-70 through 1972-73. Institutions should indicate gifts and grants revenues by fund, and explain any changes of over 5 percent.

Schedule 9, Gifts and Grants Revenues, By Type of Fund, Fiscal 1969-70 through 1972-73

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gifts and Grants Revenue
1. Current Funds
   a. Restricted
   b. Unrestricted
2. Loan Funds
3. Endowment and Similar Funds
4. Annuity and Life Income Funds
5. Plant Funds
   a. Restricted
   b. Unrestricted
6. Other Funds (Please specify)
Rationale for Question #9 and accompanying Schedule 9

Goal: A comprehensive system of post-secondary education

Objective: To assess the flow of Gifts and Grants revenues to institutions of post-secondary education in the State for identification of long range trends in the financing of post-secondary education.

Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned:

Gifts and Grants Revenues by Type of Fund, for fiscal years 1969-70 through 1972-73, and annual percentage changes.

These data are asked for these specific reasons:

1. To identify recent trends of gifts and grants revenues available to the institutions.

2. To determine whether or not the trend of gifts and grants revenues is, as has been traditionally the case, overwhelmingly for restricted purposes as opposed to unrestricted purposes which could be used by an institution for current operating expenses.

At issue: It has long been recognized that institutions could profit financially if revenues from gifts and grants could be freely used by the institution for whatever purpose was pressing - especially current operating expenses. Most donors, however, tend to prefer that their gift be used for a tangible, visible purpose. (Thus the new dormitory or library is named for its donor and this preference is honored.) In light of the pressing financial situation in many institutions, it is necessary to identify definite trends and to urge institutions to suggest that potential donors allow institutions some flexibility in the use of gifts and grants money.
10. To measure progress toward providing increased vertical and lateral mobility, the Regents must know the degree to which students transfer within the system. To this end, the Regents ask: How many students have the public and private 4-year colleges accepted as transfer students for fall 1972 and 1973?

a. From 2-year colleges (indicate public or private)?

b. From 4-year colleges (indicate public or private)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule 10, Transfer Students Accepted for Full-Time Undergraduate Study by New York State Collegiate Post-Secondary Institutions for the Years 1972 and 1973.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transfer Students from New York Institutions**

**4-Year**

Public

SUNY

CUNY

Private

**2-Year**

Students with Associate Degrees

Public

NYC-EHE Com. Coll.

Other Com. Coll.

Private
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>Fall 1972 Entering Level</th>
<th>Fall 1973 Entering Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>Upper Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students Without Degrees**

**Public**
- NYC-BHE Com. Coll.
- Other Com. Coll.

**Private**

**Transfer Students from Outside New York State Institutions**

**4-Year**

**Public**

**Private**

**2-Year**

**Students with Associate Degrees**

**Public**

**Private**

**Students without Associate Degrees**

**Public**

**Private**
Rationale for Question 10 and accompanying Schedule 10

Goal: A comprehensive system of post-secondary education

Objective: To assure that the Regents goal of increased vertical and lateral mobility is fulfilled and to insure that the State's comprehensive system of post-secondary education accommodates those students in the 2-year colleges wishing to transfer to 4-year institutions.

Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned

Number of transfer students accepted for full-time undergraduate study at 4-year institutions in the State delineated by:

- In-state and out-of-state students
- Type of institution from which student transferred

Data requested is by entering level of transferring student for fall 1972 and 1973.

These data will be used to check the validity and reliability of the transfer assumptions utilized as a basic factor in the development of the 1972 Regents Statewide Plan projections for undergraduate enrollments for the decade.

At issue: To ascertain the ability of the State's institutions to accommodate the projected number of students seeking transfers, thereby fulfilling the Regents commitment to increased vertical and lateral mobility, the preceding question is asked.
In the Regents 1972 Statewide Plan, enrollment projections were approved only through 1975. Because of the uncertainty associated with these projections due to changing financial arrangements, and in light of the additional data acquired in 1972 and 1973, the Regents want to know of any modifications an institution wishes to make to its enrollment goals.

(Explain revisions.)

Schedule 11, Full-Time Degree Credit Enrollment by Level, Actual and Projected, 1972-80.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Full-Time Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Time Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Time Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Projection A = As projected in institutional 1972 master plan.

So that all sectors may have available to them the latest information pertaining to enrollments, the Education Department will issue, in the summer of 1973, an appendix to this bulletin containing pertinent historical information, planning assumptions, and revised regional and statewide enrollment projections.
Rationale for Question 11 and accompanying Schedule 11

Goal: A comprehensive system of post-secondary education

Objective: To allow for changes in enrollment projections at post-secondary institutions which result from additional information and updated data.

Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned

- Full-time degree credit enrollment by level

Enrollment goals, as revised, will be compared with previous goals and reviewed in light of recent developments in the financing of post-secondary education to assure the goals' compatibility with the overall goals set for post-secondary education by the Regents.

At issue: In their 1972 Statewide Plan the Regents approved the undergraduate enrollment goals of the public sectors only through 1975 and deferred approval of their 1980 goals. The Regents also stated that they felt that the undergraduate enrollment goals of the private sector were optimistic although the Regents did hope that these goals could be achieved through regional utilization of the facilities in the private sector and through implementation of the Regents' financial proposals. As for graduate education, the Regents deferred approval of graduate enrollment goals for 1975 and 1980 pending the Report of the Commission on Doctoral Education. (They did approve the goals for planning purposes only.) So that all sectors may have available to them the latest information pertaining to enrollments, the Education Department will issue, in the summer of 1973, an appendix to this bulletin containing pertinent historical information, planning assumptions, and revised regional and statewide enrollment projections.
GOAL NO. III. EXCELLENCE IN THE PURSUIT OF KNOWLEDGE

12. An adequate and efficient library system is basic to the systematic search for knowledge and achievement of the highest caliber. Therefore the Regents inquire whether each institution's library now meets threshold adequacy regarding resources, staff, and facilities (according to Regents Advisory Committee guidelines) and what steps were or are needed to achieve this level.

PROVIDE NARRATIVE RESPONSE

* * *

Rationale for Question #12

Goal: Excellence in the pursuit of knowledge

Objective: To assure that the library system at each institution in the State be of sufficient capability to enable each student to engage in the pursuit of knowledge.

Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned

No specific data elements are being requested at this time. What is being requested is a qualitative analysis by the institutions comparing their library resources with the Planning Guidelines for Academic Libraries recommended by the Regents Advisory Committee on Long-Range Planning for Academic Libraries in New York State (as partially excerpted in the Regents Statewide Plan on pages 403 and 404).

At issue: The Regents have recommended in their 1972 Statewide Plan that the guidelines mentioned above become the minimum standards for all academic libraries in the State. This question speaks to this recommendation.
13. The Regents recognize the inadequacy of the presently used assessment techniques for evaluating teacher performance. They have called upon the institutions to develop new measurements of teacher quality and so wish to know what new assessment techniques each institution has developed to augment the present teacher assessment system.

PROVIDE NARRATIVE RESPONSE

*   *   *

Rationale for Question #13

**Goal:** Excellence in the pursuit of knowledge

**Objective:** To actively involve institutions in the development of new ways to measure teacher quality

**Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned**

New assessment techniques developed or under development at each teacher training institution.

These new assessment techniques will be reviewed in light of the Regents long range goal for 1980, which is "to establish a system of certification by which the State can assure the public that professional personnel in the schools possess and maintain demonstrated competence to enable children to learn."

**At issue:** The Regents have strongly endorsed the ongoing redesign of teacher preparation in the State. The ultimate goal of field-centered and competency-based courses and programs requires cooperation from all teacher education institutions to be achieved. It is essential that these institutions participate in the formulation of any new assessment techniques and mechanisms. Thus the Regents ask that institutions offer evidence of that participation.
With the massive expansion of master's education in the last decade, there is evidence that there has been a deterioration in the quality of these programs. The Regents view as a first step toward a rededication to excellence in master's programs a reevaluation of all existing programs. They therefore ask: What effort has each institution made to evaluate existing and proposed master's degree programs, to eliminate needless duplication and limit the number of programs at the master's level to those of the highest quality?

What ways has each institution found to assess the success of its master's degree programs? Provide evidence for 1972 and 1973.

What plans do the institutions have for 1974 and 1975 which show a continuation of this process?

PROVIDE NARRATIVE RESPONSE

* * *

Rationale for Question #14

Goal: Excellence in the pursuit of knowledge

Objective: To measure the extent to which all master's programs in the State, either existing or planned, attain the highest achievable level of quality.

Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned:

Evidence that each institution has reevaluated existing and planned master's programs in the interest of avoiding needless duplication and/or eliminating lesser quality programs. What measures of evaluating success has an institution utilized in this endeavor? Evidence is requested for 1972 and 1973 as well as any plans being considered for the continuation of this reevaluation for 1974 and 1975.

This information will be reviewed and analyzed to determine if institutions are conforming with the Regents intent in this area. The need for this reevaluation emerged with the publication of the report, Masters Degrees in the State of New York 1969-70, in which the Bureau of College Evaluation of the State Education Department drew attention to the haphazard proliferation of master's degree programs in the State.

At issue: The Regents have made several recommendations in their 1972 Statewide Plan for the Development of Post-Secondary Education (pages 59 and 60). These serve to emphasize the concern the Regents feel over the quality and quantity of master's degree programs. The search for excellence in all programs at all levels speaks directly to this issue.
15. In light of the findings of the recently released study on doctoral education in New York State and the concern for excellence at all levels of post-secondary education, the Regents ask that each institution submit its plans including criteria, procedures, and schedules of implementation for periodic self-evaluation of its doctoral programs.*

PROVIDE NARRATIVE RESPONSE

* * *

Rationale for Question 15

Goal: Excellence in the Pursuit of Knowledge

Objective: To achieve within available resources, a system of doctoral education of the highest quality that accommodates many needs. These are diverse and include: the need to sustain the expansion and transmission of knowledge in even the most esoteric field; the need to produce skilled manpower for employment in industry, education, government, or other sectors; the need to develop understanding and methodologies that may be used to deal with societal problems; and the need for new forms and types of programs in doctoral education.

Data Elements Required and Planned Utilization: There are no specific data elements required for this question. The responses, however, will be used as input for the review of doctoral programs, institution by institution, and discipline by discipline, which is planned by the Department in its assessment to determine those programs of high quality and need.

At issue: In light of the Regents Doctoral Commission recommendations urging a concentration of high quality and needed doctoral programs at a relatively limited number of institutions, and in the interest of the most efficient and economical use of limited resources, the doctoral institutions of the State have a responsibility to review their own doctoral program plans. This review should consider the importance of the doctoral offerings to the institution's overall purpose and should reconsider the benefits of allocation of resources to doctoral programs as compared with other needs on the campus.

* The inclusion of question #15 in the progress report bulletin is contingent upon Regents approval of the recommendations of the Regents Commission on Doctoral Education.
IV. MEETING THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF SOCIETY

16. In order to assure that those students entering 2-year, career-oriented programs attain the highest level of self-realization through eventual job success, the Regents ask:

Does your institution conduct a follow-up of graduates of career-oriented programs?

Please provide annual information on graduates of these programs for the academic years 1970-71 through 1972-73, utilizing the schedule below.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total Graduates of 2-Year Career-Oriented Programs
  (1) Number placed in jobs directly related to training
  (2) Number placed in jobs unrelated to training
  (3) Number transferred to 4-year colleges

A. Specific Field #1

Number of Graduates
  (1) Number placed in jobs directly related to training
  (2) Number placed in jobs unrelated to training
  (3) Number transferred to 4-year colleges

1 A career-oriented program is one which culminates in an AAS or AOS degree.

2 Please enter the name of each specific program as well as the number of graduates in that program and the subsequent placement and transfer data.
Schedule 12, Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Specific Field #2</th>
<th>1970-71</th>
<th>1971-72</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Number placed in jobs directly related to training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Number placed in jobs unrelated to training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Number transferred to 4-year colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Specific Field #3</th>
<th>1970-71</th>
<th>1971-72</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please continue listing, as shown above, if necessary.
Rationale for Question #16 and Accompanying Schedule #12

Goal: Meeting the educational needs of society

Objective: To measure the progress that 2-year post-secondary institutions are making toward the Regents 1972 Statewide Plan recommendation, that these institutions increase the number of graduates of career-oriented programs who enter the job market.

Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned:

The number of 2-year career-oriented graduates (total and by program field)

The number of graduates placed in jobs directly related to their academic training (total and by field)

The number placed in jobs unrelated to their training (total and by field)

The number transferred to 4-year colleges (total and by field)

Actual data for 1970-71 through 1972-73

Responses to the question will be used to determine the number of 2-year institutions that conduct follow-up studies on graduates of career-oriented programs. In addition, identification of variances in training/utilization relationships by occupational field and by institution will provide a partial data base for investigation of the need for modification of course content and regional program planning to improve the effectiveness of the vocational preparation programs.

At issue:

The Regents are cognizant of the contribution made in the field of post-secondary occupational education by the community colleges, agricultural and technical colleges and other 2-year post-secondary institutions of the State. In addition, they are aware of the shifts occurring in the labor market in terms of demand for workers in various fields and in relation to the increasing expectations of employers. A recent Carnegie Commission study recommended that more data be collected on occupational and industrial employment patterns of graduates of 2-year colleges and that follow-up studies be conducted of community college graduates. The Regents, in their 1972 Statewide Plan, recommended an increase in the numbers of 2-year post-secondary program graduates who enter the job market. This question will enable appraisal of movement by the institutions in these recommended directions.
To encourage better articulation between 2- and 4-year institutions which will result in more vertical and lateral mobility for the students, the Regents ask each 4-year institution to provide information showing how many 2-year degree holders transferred to the institution in the Fall of 1972 and the Fall of 1973. Indicate the number of course credits transferred and the number who received their degree the preceding year. (See Schedule 13 below).

Schedule 13, Number of 2-Year Graduates Accepted and Enrolled for Full-Time Undergraduate Study at 4-Year Institutions and the Number of Course Credits Transferred, Fall 1972 through Fall 1973.

| I. Total Number of 2-Year Graduates Accepted and Enrolled for Full-Time Study |
|---|---|---|
| (1) | (2) | (3) |

A. Number of A.A. and A.S. Degree Graduates Accepted and Enrolled for Full-Time Study

- Within parallel programs
- Within non-parallel programs

1. Number with A.A. or A.S. degree from preceding year
2. Number of course credits transferred by A.A. and A.S. graduates
   a. Within parallel programs
   b. Within non-parallel programs
3. Number of additional course credits required for baccalaureate
   a. Within parallel programs
   b. Within non-parallel programs
Schedule 13, Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 1972</th>
<th>Fall 1973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Number of A.A.S. Degree Graduates
   Accepted and Enrolled for Full-Time Study
   
   - Within parallel programs
   - Within non-parallel programs

1. Number with A.A.S. degree from preceding year
2. Number of course credits transferred by A.A.S. graduates
   - Within parallel programs
   - Within non-parallel programs
3. Number of additional course credits required for baccalaureate
   - Within parallel programs
   - Within non-parallel programs

C. Number of A.O.S. Degree Graduates
   Accepted and Enrolled for Full-Time Study
   
   - Within parallel programs
   - Within non-parallel programs

1. Number with A.O.S. degree from preceding year
Schedule 13, Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 1972</th>
<th>Fall 1973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Number of course credits transferred by A.O.S. graduates
   a. Within parallel programs
   b. Within non-parallel programs

3. Number of additional course credits required for baccalaureate
   a. Within parallel programs
   b. Within non-parallel programs
Rationale for Question #17 and Accompanying Schedule 12

Goal: Meeting the educational needs of society

Objective: To provide a comprehensive system of post-secondary education that will allow the participating individual a maximum degree of vertical and lateral mobility, regardless of his initial academic orientation.

Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned:

- Total number of 2-year graduates enrolled for full-time study, by type of 2-year degree.
- Number with degree from preceding year, by type of 2-year degree.
- Number of course credits transferred, by type of 2-year degree and by program type.
- Number of additional course credits required for baccalaureate, by type of 2-year degree and by program type.

Actual data for fall 1972 and fall 1973. To identify trends in articulation and transfer patterns of 2-year degree graduates, these trends will be analyzed and compared with the student transfer assumptions (made in the Regents 1972 Statewide Plan) for projecting student population demands for the decade.

At issue: The plight of the student who wishes to transfer to a 4-year institution as a junior, after completing a 2-year degree program, has held the attention of educators for some time. The improvement of course content of A.A. and A.S. programs and the increasing communication between 2-year and 4-year institutions and faculty have considerably increased the transferability of A.A. and A.S. degree credits earned. There are still, however, difficulties encountered by the student who enrolls in a 2-year A.A.S. or A.O.S. program and then decides to further his collegiate training upon graduation. The Regents need to examine this issue to insure fulfillment of their commitment to the maximization of vertical and lateral mobility within the post-secondary educational system of the State.
V. A SYSTEM RESPONSIVE TO COMMUNITY NEEDS

18. In their 1972 statewide plan, the Regents have affirmed that learning can take place both on and off a college campus. In an effort to increase options for regularly enrolled students who learn better in an unstructured and/or nontraditional atmosphere, the Regents have urged the development of new programs designed to accommodate these students. Therefore, the Regents ask what steps each institution has taken to encourage independent or nontraditional study within the framework of the institution through such ways as:

a. Providing an opportunity for independent study in regular introductory as well as advanced courses. Indicate the number of students engaged in independent study courses by level (advanced vs. introductory), for 1970-71 through 1972-73 (use Schedule 14), and describe the academic fields involved.

b. Providing off-campus learning experiences for regularly enrolled students, such as those associated with "extended campus" programs such as "University Without Walls," Empire State College, or Syracuse University's Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies concept. Briefly describe your program(s), and indicate the number of students who participated in such learning experiences for 1970-71 through 1972-73. Use Schedule 14.

Schedule 14, Number of Students Engaged in Independent Study (by Course Level) or Extended Campus Programs, 1970-71 through 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Field and Course Level</th>
<th>1970-71</th>
<th>1971-72</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Academic Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Introductory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Campus Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Such extended campus learning experiences could involve regularly enrolled students in a correspondence course study for credit, credit for "field experience" education, or course work taken off-campus under the aegis of approved adjunct faculty. Normal extension work programs should not be considered as part of the "extended campus."
Goal: A system responsive to community needs

Objective: To assess the degree to which institutions of post-secondary education have complied with the Regents desire for expanded student options through the establishment of courses and programs aimed at those students who learn better in an unstructured and/or non-traditional atmosphere.

Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned

a. The number of students enrolled in independent study courses for the years 1970-71 through the years 1972-73, and whether the course was at the introductory or advanced undergraduate level.

b. The Regents also ask for information as to which institutions are involved actively in "extended campus programs" and therefore ask institutions to provide data on the number of students in such programs in the academic years 1970-71 through 1972-73.

One of the best ways to measure how successful the independent study courses and programs have been is to find out how many students an institution is willing to allow to participate in a program. The establishment of courses at the introductory level as well as at the advanced level is one more indicator of commitment to non-traditional study, but more importantly, it is a measure of the institution's commitment to the efficacy of independent study for all levels and abilities within its student body. The Regents will use these data to promote the concept of independent study, and the effectiveness of the various non-traditional off-campus "extended campus" learning methodologies.

At issue: The Regents have repeatedly supported the independent learner and the concept that learning can take place both on and off a college campus. The limitations imposed upon the learning potential of students by restricting them to a stated number of 50-minute classroom exposures must be overcome. The Regents, in their 1972 Statewide Plan, have advocated a learning atmosphere which will provide an environment conducive to individual development and which will stimulate maximum creativity. A weaving of vocational interest, work experience, classroom interaction and work application into the fabric of instruction will render a more perfect climate for learning. This question elicits information related to this Regents concern.
In an effort to be responsive to community needs, the Regents have recommended that institutions grant course credit for college-level knowledge acquired outside of the formal collegiate post-secondary system and before the student becomes regularly enrolled. Such non-traditional learning can result from on-the-job training, independent study, military service, or in many other ways. Recognition can be carried out on an institution-wide or on a departmental basis, and may be validated by institutional mechanisms or faculty-made examinations or through examinations offered by the College Proficiency Examination Program (CPEP) or the College Level Examination Program (CLEP). On the other hand, institutions often grant course credit for non-traditional educational experiences validated in the military, through the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI), or the military service school courses validated in the American Council of Education's Guide to the Evaluation of Service School Educational Experiences, which is prepared by the ACE's Commission on the Accreditation of Service Experiences (CASE). Finally, many institutions award course credit for college level knowledge obtained in non-traditional learning experiences offered by such agencies as the New York State Police Academy, industrial training programs of various types, and/or proprietary schools. The Regents ask you to respond to each designated item below.

a. Does your institution:

(1) Award course credit for non-traditional learning validated by:
(a) Faculty developed challenge examinations
(b) CLEP or CPEP tests

(2) Award course credit for learning experiences taken in the military:
(a) Through the United States Armed Forces Institute courses and tests
(b) Through military service school courses, as listed in the CASE Guide

(3) Award course credit on the basis of certificates of transcripts for non-traditional learning which takes place off campus through, e.g., the New York State Police Academy, various industrial training programs, proprietary schools, and so forth, without on-campus validation? If so, please give three or four examples of non-traditional agencies whose academic work your institution routinely recognizes for course credit:

b. Do most undergraduate departments at your institution award course credit on the basis of the categories listed above? Respond "yes" or "no" to each item (1)(a)_; (1)(b)_; (2)(a)_; (2) (b)_; (3)_.

c. How many students were awarded course credit in academic years 1970-1971, 1971-1972, and 1972-1973, through items (1), (2), and (3), respectively?
d. In a brief paragraph, describe how your institution makes decisions in terms of granting credit for non-traditional learning experiences acquired before enrollment in your school, in order to maintain academic standards, and to meet the needs of incoming students. Is the authority to make such decisions centralized in some sort of faculty/administration committee or mechanism, or dispersed to the several departments, to do with it as they choose? Once a policy to grant course credit for non-traditional learning is instituted, how is it publicized to prospective students? What general plans do you have, if any, to institute or broaden institutional policies in granting credit for learning acquired outside of your regular institutional framework?

PROVIDE NARRATIVE RESPONSE

* * *

Rationale for Question #19

Goal: A system response to community needs

Objective: To assure that institutions of post-secondary education are incorporating mechanisms which award degree credit for applicable off-campus learning experiences.

Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned

Types of non-traditional learning recognized, and methods of recognition
Actual data 1970-71 through 1972-73

These data elements will provide a quantitative measure of the progress made by institutions in providing credit for off-campus learning. The data will be collated by type and control of institution and by region for trend identification. The data will be utilized by the Regents in a general way to promote the recognition of college-level knowledge; however, that knowledge is required among the post-secondary education community in their State.

At issue: The Regents, as observable in the successful College Proficiency Examination and Regents External Degree programs, have long advocated that individuals who engage in post-secondary learning through avenues other than collegiate campuses, should be awarded formal recognition for knowledge gained.

The utilization of all learning facilities represents sound educational and fiscal practice. Should a person care to apply his acquired skills and knowledges toward fulfilling the requirements of an academic degree, institutions should be ready, willing and able to validate the student's past experiences in relation to the degree sought.
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In order to examine factors related to enrollment projections, the Regents ask that institutions provide data on survival rates, by level.

Schedule 15, Cohort Survival Data Pertaining to Full-Time Degree Credit Undergraduate Enrollment, 1969-73*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Initial Cohort Fall 1969</th>
<th>No. of Initial Cohort Surviving as of Year Indicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>Fall 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time, Full-Time Freshman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Sophomore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Senior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicate the yearly full-time academic level of only the Fall 1969 first-time, full-time freshman population (exclude in-transfers and additional first-time students). If data restrictions prohibit a survival examination of the 1969 freshman class, enter survival data for the earliest possible freshman class.

NOTE: In filling out the above schedule, enter the number of first-time, full-time freshman as of Fall 1969 in Column 2, then indicate the status of that population by level per year. For example, if out of a 1969 freshman class of 100, 95 go on to be sophomores, 3 drop out of school and 2 repeat their freshman year in 1970, then in Column 3 there would be 2 freshmen and 95 sophomores indicated. Should any drop-outs from the original 1969 freshman population return as full-time students, they would be re-entered at the level and in the year they returned.

1 Definition of first-time, full-time freshmen: "New Freshmen not previously enrolled in your institution or in any institution of higher education. Include students admitted under AdvancedCredit or AdvancedPlacement plans (who received some credits through examinations, test scores, etc.). Exclude transfer students and students who were enrolled in summer programs."
Rationale for Question #20 and accompanying Schedule 15

Goal: A system responsive to community needs

Objective: To determine if the present institutional program structure is responsive to the educational and societal needs of the expanded student clientele.

Data Elements Required and Utilization Planned

Cohort survival data that would follow the progress of the 1969 entering freshman class through each year to the present. Data for the 1969 class are requested, but if these data are not available, data from the earliest possible year are acceptable.

These data will be used in two ways:

1. The retention by level within an institution will be reviewed to identify trends among various types of institutions.

2. The impact on enrollment projections generated by the institutions and by the Regents can be greatly affected should these data show any wide fluctuation of attrition rates. This impact should be evaluated and considered by all concerned with planning for the future of post-secondary education in the State.

At issue: There currently do not exist any data on attrition rates at post-secondary institutions in New York State. While the sample data requested will enable the Regents to assess the impact of expanded student clienteles on selected institutions' enrollments and program structure, it will not provide data on why students left these institutions. It is hoped that this question will be the first step -- to attempt to quantify the dimensions of the problem -- and that subsequently, the Education Department will begin to investigate the reasons for any abnormal attrition rates. As a result of this investigation, the Department may undertake a full-sample study as part of the 1976 Statewide Plan.
Classification of Public Colleges and Universities

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

University Centers

Albany
Binghamton
Buffalo
Stony Brook

University Colleges

Brockport
Buffalo
Cortland
Empire State College
Fredonia
Genesee
New Paltz
Old Westbury
Oneonta
Oswego
Plattsburgh
Potsdam
Purchase
Utica–Rome

Health Sciences Centers

Buffalo
Downstate
Stony Brook
Upstate

Specialized Colleges

Environmental Science and Forestry
Maritime
Optometry

Statutory Colleges

Agriculture and Life Sciences at Cornell University
Ceramics at Alfred
Human Ecology at Cornell
Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell
Veterinary College at Cornell

Excludes Federally-sponsored institutions.
Two-Year Colleges – Agricultural and Technical Colleges

Alfred
Canton
Cobleskill
Delhi
Farmingdale
Morrisville

Two-Year Colleges – Community Colleges Outside New York City

Adirondack
Auburn
Broome
Clinton
Columbia–Greene
Community College of the Finger Lakes
Corning
Dutchess
Erie
Fashion Institute of Technology
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

Community Colleges in New York City

Borough of Manhattan
Bronx
Hostos
Kingsborough
LaGuardia

1Community colleges sponsored by the New York City Board of Higher Education under the program of the State University of New York.
Community Colleges in New York City (Continued)

New York City
Queensborough
Staten Island

CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK (THE)

Graduate School and University Center

Senior Colleges

Baruch College
Brooklyn College
City College
Evers College
Hunter College
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Lehman College
Queens College
Richmond College
York College
Classification of Private Colleges and Universities

**UNIVERSITIES**

**Multiversities**

- Columbia University
- Cornell University
- New York University
- Syracuse University
- University of Rochester (The)

**Universities**

- Adelphi University
- Fordham University
- Hofstra University
- Long Island University
- Brooklyn Center
- Brooklyn College of Pharmacy
- C. W. Post Center
- Southampton College
- St. John's University
- Yeshiva University

**COLLEGES**

**College Complexes**

- Alfred University
- Barnard College, Columbia University
- Canisius College
- Colgate University
- D'Youville College
- Elmira College
- Hamilton College
- Hartwick College
- Hobart and William Smith Colleges
- Iona College
- Ithaca College
- LeMoyne College
- Manhattan College
- Manhattanville College
- New School for Social Research
- Niagara University
- Pace University
- Russell Sage College (Includes Junior College of Albany)
- St. Bonaventure University
- St. Lawrence University
- Sarah Lawrence College
- Skidmore College
- Union College, Union University
College Complexes (Continued)

Vassar College
Wagner College
Wells College

Colleges

Bard College
Briarcliff College
College of Mount St. Vincent
College of New Rochelle (The)
College of Saint Rose (The)
College of White Plains (The)
Concordia College
Dominican College of Blauvelt
Dowling College
Eisenhower College
Finch College
Friends World College
Houghton College
Keuka College
King's College (The)
Kirkland College
Ladycliff College
Marist College
Marymount College
Marymount Manhattan College
Medaille College
Mercy College
Molloy College
Mount St. Mary College
Nazareth College
Roberts Wesleyan College
Rosary Hill College
St. Francis College
St. John Fisher College
St. Joseph's College
St. Thomas Aquinas College
Siena College
Touro College
Utica College, Syracuse University
Wadhams Hall

ENGINEERING AND TECHNICAL SCHOOLS

Clarkson College of Technology
Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art (The)
New York Institute of Technology
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
Pratt Institute
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Rochester Institute of Technology
Webb Institute of Naval Architecture
SPECIALIZED COLLEGES

Albany Law School, Union University
Bank Street College
Brooklyn Law School
College of Insurance (The)
Juilliard School (The)
Manhattan School of Music
Mannes College of Music (The)
Mills College of Education
New York Law School
Parsons School of Design (Affiliated with New School for Social Research)
Teachers College, Columbia University

HEALTH CENTERS

Albany College of Pharmacy, Union University
Albany Medical College, Union University
College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Columbia University
Mt. Sinai School of Medicine (Affiliated with the City University of New York)
New York College of Podiatric Medicine (The)
New York Medical College
Rockefeller University (The)

SEMINARIES AND RELIGIOUS TRAINING COLLEGES

Cathedral College of the Immaculate Conception
Colgate Rochester-Bexley Hall-Crozer Divinity School
General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church
Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion
Holy Trinity Orthodox Seminary
Immaculate Conception Seminary at Troy
Jewish Theological Seminary of America (The)
Maryknoll Seminary
Mount St. Alphonsus Redemptorist Seminary
New York Theological Seminary
Nycack College
Passionist Monastic Seminary (The)
Rabbi Isaac Elchanon Theological Seminary
Seminary of the Immaculate Conception of the Diocese of Rockville Centre
St. Anthony-on-Hudson
St. Bernard's Seminary
St. John Vianney Seminary
St. Joseph's Seminary and College
St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary
Union Theological Seminary
Woodstock College

TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

General Colleges (Liberal Arts/Teacher Education)

Bennett College
Cazenovia College
General Colleges (Liberal Arts/Teacher Education) (Continued)

Elizabeth Seton College
Five Towns College
Harriman College
Hilbert College
Maria College of Albany
Maria Regina College
Mater Dei College
Trocaire College
Villa Maria College of Buffalo

Specialized Colleges

Academy of Aeronautics
College for Human Services (The)
Culinary Institute of America
LaSalette Seminary
Paul Smith's College of Arts and Sciences