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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This self-study blends nicely with the long-term efforts of the College to build a “culture of improvement.” We selected the self-study model “comprehensive with areas of special emphasis” in order to merge Middle States accreditation goals and standards with our own mission and long range strategic planning process, selecting the following emphasis areas: Planning and Assessment; Equity, Access, and Diversity; Intellectual Climate; Technology; Institutional Context (Internal and External); and Infrastructure. A recent SUNY-wide mission review process led to additional campus goals that were also woven into our improvement plan and the self-study.

As described in the document, the self-study was carried out by a large number of groups and individuals representing all areas of the College. Work groups for each of the special emphasis areas wrote their chapters, while administrators prepared those chapters related to the comprehensive component of the self-study. All reports were edited by the Middle States Steering Committee, and the final report approved by President Judson H. Taylor. The end result is a candid presentation of how we are doing as an institution, culminating with a series of recommendations that will guide our strategic planning well into the future. It should be noted that implementation of recommendations that require significant additional funding may be delayed somewhat as the State of New York recovers from the devastating impact of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001.

The story told in this document focuses on how the College meets Middle States standards and, at the same time, responds constructively to the challenges of growth, decline, diversity, and accountability. In 1996, when our Periodic Review Report was being prepared we had a headcount of 6,200 students - in 2002 we have more than 7,700 students. The Enrollment Management unit, which includes Admissions, Financial Aid, the Registrar, and Advisement, completely reversed the downward enrollment trend of the early 1990's with help from the entire campus community. Much of this growth has occurred in our best-known traditional programs, teacher education and physical education, and in a new major, sport management. Increases in graduate enrollment, particularly in education programs, have been fueled by teacher turnover and a New York State requirement that all credentialed teachers earn a Master’s degree within five years (soon to be three years) of their first assignment.

Enrollment declines in some of our traditional arts and sciences programs prompted us to seek and secure a $1.75 million Title III grant to address this challenge. Excessive student demand for some programs has produced a new level of enrollment management activity with more focused recruitment of students and increased control of entry into majors. A major recommendation emerging from the self-study is increased involvement of faculty in the recruitment of students, especially in new programs created through the Title III program and for programs that are under-enrolled.

One of the major goals that emerged from our long range planning process shortly after the arrival of President Taylor in 1995 was “…to refine the curriculum to meet societal needs.” This thrust, along with the Title III proposal and external mandates in education, prompted program proposals in a wide variety of fields including: Water resource management, geographic information systems, new communications media, conservation biology, professional writing, musical theater, special education, second language learning, early childhood education, athletic training, and sport management. All existing education programs were rewritten to comply with State Education Department reforms and NCATE standards. This latter activity has occupied an enormous amount of faculty time and financial resources. The positive result is that we now have a curriculum that is indeed more responsive to societal needs. In order to assure the success and relevance of our programs, we have completed the first round of outcomes assessment for all academic programs. In 2001, faculty from virtually every program presented their assessment findings to the President’s Cabinet, complete with a discussion of appropriate curricular changes already made or to be made. Major recommendations related to academic affairs include increasing full-time faculty, improving the management of enrollment, and examining the organizational structure of academic affairs.

Enrollment growth, accompanied by four years of retirement incentives, has produced a need for a large number of new full-time faculty. The retirement incentive has typically been announced in the fall, with most retirees leaving at mid-year thus requiring the use of large numbers of part-timers in some departments. These conditions left a narrow window of opportunity for filling the positions with full-timers by the following fall. The cumulative outcome has been more than 50 percent turnover of full-time faculty in the last four years. This high rate of turnover has made it difficult to achieve the president’s goal of 80 percent of all courses being taught by full-time
faculty. To move us toward this goal, 23 positions have been converted from part-time to full-time, and 10 new full-time positions have been approved for 2002. If all openings are filled we should be close to the 80 percent goal.

Significant gains have been made in increasing the number of women faculty and moderate gains in recruiting faculty from underrepresented groups, but we need to redouble our efforts in the latter area. The new faculty we have brought to Cortland have outstanding credentials and excellent teaching skills, particularly in the use of technology to enhance instruction. Expanding faculty development opportunities for new and veteran faculty is one of the report’s major recommendations that must be addressed in the coming years.

Growth has also required an increase in support staff with the greatest needs in areas directly serving students. The burgeoning use of technology has compelled us to hire numerous specialists in information resources. The imposition of a technology fee has produced additional revenue to support some of the costs in this area. Overall, students and faculty have excellent access to technology and the support they need to use it wisely.

Implementation of a comprehensive assessment plan led to an expansion of the mission and staffing of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA). This office has played a critical role in facilitating the development of effective academic outcomes assessment plans, instruments, and reports. In addition, services provided by OIRA helped make it possible to extend our college outcomes assessment plan to support and service units and, like our academic programs, virtually all these units have completed one assessment round, including presentations to the President’s Cabinet.

The Student Affairs Division of the College is staffed by a well-prepared cadre of professionals who provide high quality support to our students. Growth has affected this division in terms of increased demand for services in all offices. The increased number of upper division students who wish to stay on campus, and a reduction in the number of beds to make rehabilitated halls more livable, has prompted us to assess the need for additional on-campus student housing. Despite some crowding in the fall semester, housing conditions and services are rated quite highly by our students.

A student affairs program suffering serious growing pains is disability services. A recent tripling of students arriving with diagnosed learning disabilities will require us to find additional resources to support this program. Increased demand for counseling and tutoring assistance has also been noted. University police officers provide highly valued services to the campus with a heavy demand for parking presenting special challenges. Student health services and recreational sports are two of our most highly prized programs, leading the SUNY system in student approval ratings. Judicial affairs handles a large caseload effectively as we hold our students accountable for their behavior on and off campus. Diversity efforts have been greatly enhanced by the Office of Multicultural Affairs, which provides special programming and support for students from underrepresented groups as well as the campus at large. Major recommendations in student affairs include expanding the search for external funding, increasing professional development opportunities for staff, and planning a new residence hall and recreation center.

The success of the Office of Institutional Advancement, particularly in fund raising, is one the major growth-related success stories at Cortland. Although the campus has had an outstanding alumni relations program for many years, prior to 1996 little had been invested in translating good relations into financial support. Additional staffing, strong leadership, and the initiation of the College’s first capital campaign have yielded excellent results. The Foundation’s endowment has increased from $3 million to $8 million over the past four years, and $6 million of the campaign’s $10 million goal has already been raised. Scholarship funds provided by the Foundation totaling more than $750,000 in 2001 alone have allowed us to attract and retain a significant number of outstanding students. The other services in institutional advancement complement nicely the work done in development. Far reaching alumni programs, award winning publications, timely public relations, and comprehensive sports information allow the College to tell its story to thousands of people throughout the state and country. Major recommendations for the future include acquiring an alumni house, increasing alumni chapters, and expanding support for Web maintenance.

In the summer of 1995, the College and its new president were confronted with a serious budget shortfall due to declining enrollment and diminishing state support. In 2002, the College is facing another budget reduction caused by the economic downturn and the September 11 tragedy, but we now have a budget reserve that will soften the impact. Enrollment growth, and effective management of resources by the vice president of finance and management and her staff have been the major factors in the turnaround in the College’s financial condition. Energy
conservation, retention of enrollment overflow funds, the generation of new resources, and careful monitoring of all campus budgets have helped generate the reserve. Human Resources has been especially effective in the past few years guiding the recruitment and orientation of numerous new faculty and staff. In fact, all functions in the finance and management area have faced special challenges related to the growth of students and employees. Implementation of a comprehensive assessment plan in each unit has contributed to cost saving practices and improved services.

State funding for implementation of Cortland’s five-year facilities master plan in 1998 has produced the most construction activity on the campus in 30 years. By the end of 2003, more than $50 million worth of projects will have been completed. Refurbished buildings, three miles of new sidewalks, PCB replacements, and the construction of a new two-field stadium complex are just a few of the projects guided to completion by our outstanding Office of Facilities Planning. This office is supported by the equally productive Physical Plant team, which maintains 41 buildings and 191 acres. Physical plant implemented an outcomes assessment plan several years ago that became a model for other offices on campus. Major recommendations from the finance and management domain include developing a long-term space allocation plan, improving procedures for hiring new staff, and studying the need for additional off-site learning centers.

Long range planning has been given special attention in the past five years. A collaborative process involving the administration and the Faculty Senate produces a set of priority goals and action plans. In order to assure an ongoing commitment to strategic planning, resource allocation has been linked to the approved plans. Each objective of the action plan also includes “indicators of success” which become part of the overall campus assessment effort. As a core activity in building a culture of improvement, it was decided that every budgeted unit on campus, including the President’s Office, should be fully engaged in assessment. Assessment plans are approved in accordance with a set of standards set by the College’s Assessment Committee, support is offered in the development of the plans including consultation and funds for training and instrumentation, and units are required to present their findings and how they were used to improve services to the President’s Cabinet. Written feedback is provided on each report. The first round of assessment reports is now complete and a schedule has been established to assure continuity of implementation. In order to improve the process, it has been recommended that attitudes toward the assessment process be evaluated, and that students be more actively engaged in both long range planning and assessment.

Another priority goal of the College relates to equity, access, and diversity. Task forces focusing on student and faculty recruitment and retention generated a series of recommendations and action plans that are being pursued throughout the campus community. The goal of increasing the number of new students from underrepresented groups by 10 percent a year has been met in each of the last two years. Scholarships offered through the Cortland Urban Recruitment of Educators program have helped attract new students from underrepresented groups as has the Educational Opportunity Program. An active Center for Multicultural and Gender Studies offers a wide array of programs to sensitize and educate students, faculty, and community members to current realities and the value of celebrating diversity. This goal will remain a high priority for years to come as we strive to create a more diverse student body and faculty population in a racially isolated region of New York State. Two recommendations intended to improve student retention include establishing a standing advisory committee on diversity issues with representatives from all offices that recruit and serve students from underrepresented groups and adding additional staff to the Multicultural Affairs Office.

Creating a climate that better promotes the intellectual goals of the institution has been a long-standing challenge at the College. Although the entering profile of students is fairly typical of comprehensive colleges in the United States, a substantial number of faculty believe many students are not as committed to academic excellence as they should be. In order to address this concern, the College has initiated a number of new programs and initiatives. The dramatic increase in funds available for merit scholarships has allowed us to recruit a cadre of exceptional students including eleven valedictorians and salutatorian in the class of 2001 alone. The introduction of a required first-year experience course has placed an emphasis on how to be successful academically and socially in a college setting. An annual Scholars’ Day where students join faculty in presenting research findings to the campus community has further emphasized the value placed on intellectual pursuits, and a wide range of seminars featuring leading scholars offers additional opportunities for improving the intellectual climate. We also strive to maintain a strong emphasis on academics in our 25-sport athletic program by requiring all coaches to have advanced degrees and to teach as part of their work assignment. And, the Memorandum of Understanding with SUNY System Administration commits
the College to a more selective admissions policy. The priority goal to support innovative teaching should further advance the academic goal. Some of the recommendations emanating from this part of the self-study include reactivating an academic convocation, increasing faculty development efforts to promote innovative teaching, and exploring ways to further bolster attendance at intellectual and cultural events.

Stunning advances in technology at Cortland have influenced every facet of college life. SMART classrooms and classroom management systems like WebCT have motivated a significant percentage of faculty to integrate technology into their teaching. A computer on every desk and in every residence hall room has allowed for greatly enhanced communication. A new student information management system is making possible degree audits, grade reporting, on-line registration, and other student and faculty friendly services. Computer-based resources and training provided by Memorial Library are giving students and faculty nearly limitless access to information. Our administrative and academic computing service units provide exemplary support through open access computer labs, workshops, on-line consulting, and a help desk. Media specialists also provide distance learning assistance in the regular classroom and in two synchronous learning classrooms. A technology fee and the Title III grant are helping supplement state funding for hardware, training, and support services. As technology utilization expands, demand for additional hardware, bandwidth, personnel, and training will also increase. Our five-year plan must be updated every year to maintain a competitive edge in this important facet of education. Other important recommendations related to technology are ensuring that all academic programs include clear and rigorous information technology competencies and developing a college-wide plan for distance learning.

As a member of the 64-campus State University of New York system, the largest employer in Cortland County, and one of the largest teacher preparation institutions in the United States, we must be ever vigilant about our relationship with external stakeholders. We are guided by the policies of the Board of Trustees, and various SUNY System offices that allow a significant degree of autonomy in some areas and direct control in others. Close working relationships are cultivated with our area legislators who in turn seek support for us in the budget process. Funds for our new stadium complex were secured because our legislators believed such a facility would benefit both the College and the community. Members of our College Council who are appointed by the Governor also play an important role in gaining support. One of our greatest challenges is meeting external mandates while maintaining the sense of ownership needed to keep morale and performance high. Recent reforms intended to improve the quality of teacher preparation have come down from the Board of Regents, the New York State Education Department, the SUNY Board of Trustees, the federal government, and NCATE. Faculty members have responded amazingly well to this unusual flurry of mandates.

Relations with the local community are also vital to the well-being of the College. A grant from HUD has enabled us to lead the way in bringing community agencies throughout the county together to better serve their clientele. Numerous administrators and faculty serve on local boards, and as members of service organizations. The large number of students who serve internships and volunteer in the community also contribute significantly to our community relations effort and allow us to live up to the principle that “when we join hands we reach twice as far.” As a charter member in the newly formed New York Campus Compact we will be expanding service learning which will put even more students into important roles in the community.

As we look at the collective impact of this self-study, it has affirmed our commitment to the mission and motto of the College, Making a Difference: Educating for the Common Good. Our culture of improvement is being realized through planning and the self-examination that comes with systematic assessment. Stabilizing enrollment and implementing the new programs identified to address societal needs will produce new opportunities to further enhance the intellectual and social development of our students.
CHAPTER 1

The College and its Accreditation History

The State University of New York College at Cortland (SUNY Cortland) is one of thirteen comprehensive four-year colleges in the State University of New York (SUNY) system. Established in 1868 as the Cortland Normal School, SUNY Cortland became a State Teachers College with four-year programs in 1941 and officially joined the SUNY system in 1948. In 1961 Cortland became the SUNY College at Cortland, assuming a new role as a college of arts and sciences, and the liberal arts program was introduced in 1963. Under the Carnegie system, SUNY Cortland is classified as a Master’s level I public comprehensive institution, offering undergraduate and graduate programs to the master’s level and the post-master’s Certificate of Advanced Study. Students are registered in either the School of Arts and Sciences or the School of Professional Studies.

SUNY Cortland was originally accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools in 1948, and was reaccredited in 1962, 1972, 1982, and 1992. In its 1992 report the visiting Middle States evaluation team said that SUNY Cortland had much to be proud of as an institution of higher education, pointing in particular to the commitment of its faculty and staff and the high level of satisfaction expressed by students. This same team, however, observed that the College demonstrated weaknesses in several areas and, although the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) acted to reaffirm SUNY Cortland’s accreditation in 1992, it did request that annual reports be submitted on: 1) progress in implementing planning and assessment; 2) the refinement of general education; and, 3) finances and resource management. These reports were submitted in October 1993, October 1994, and December 1995. At that point the CHE acted to negate further annual reports, asking that the Periodic Review Report (PRR) due in June 1997 focus on progress in implementing strategic long range planning.

In 1997 SUNY Cortland submitted its Periodic Review Report (PRR) to the Middle States Association and received a laudatory review indicating that the hard work the College had started under new president Judson H. Taylor, who came to the campus in July 1995, had paid off. Specifically, reviewers referred to the PRR as “a model of its kind” and stated that the College had taken the 1992 evaluation by the CHE to heart, “engaging in a rigorous and continuing process of self-analysis, planning and assessment.” Noting that SUNY Cortland appeared to be in the “process of redefining itself and most of its services to students and the community,” the reviewers concluded
“The College is approaching the future in a careful and deliberative method . . . and is to be congratulated for embracing the planning process so thoroughly.”

Reviewers also commented on progress in the other two areas that were of concern in the 1992 evaluation. With respect to general education, they observed that the College had begun a protracted process of general education reform after that time, leading to a new program introduced in 1995. The reviewers also stated that SUNY Cortland had successfully ended the dual general education tracks for transfer students and first-year students and was working toward bringing the program in line with available resources. Still, concerns were expressed over the lack of student learning outcomes data from general education courses as well as the fact that no single individual had specific responsibility for administering the general education program. Finally, the reviewers concluded that SUNY Cortland was paying close attention to finances and resource management, and that a better model was in place for ensuring that resources matched institutional priorities. According to the evaluators, “Budget requests and allocations are now data driven, supported with qualitative and quantitative data.”

The 2002 Accreditation Process

In preparation for the 2002 visit of the Middle States external evaluation team, in January 2000 President Taylor appointed a Steering Committee consisting of Provost William F. Sharp (replaced by Elizabeth Davis-Russell who became provost in July 2001), Executive Assistant to the President Patricia L. Francis, Professor of Exercise Science and Sport Studies Joy L. Hendrick, Professor and Chair of Health Joseph F. Governali, Professor and Chair of Political Science Jerome O’Callaghan, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment Robert Ploutz-Snyder, and Assistant Director of Career Services John Shirley. Student Government Association President Ryan Bond joined the committee in Fall 2001, replacing a student who had served in 2000-01 but was no longer at the College. President Taylor asked Dr. Hendrick to serve as faculty chair of the Steering Committee, while Dr. Francis served as administrative chair and editor.

During Spring 2000 the Steering Committee elected to approach the institutional self-study as a comprehensive study with the following emphasis areas: Equity, Access, and Diversity; Infrastructure; Institutional Context (External and Internal); Intellectual Climate; Planning and Assessment; and, Technology. The choice of emphasis areas resulted in part from the 1992 and 1997 Middle States evaluations, but it also reflected findings that had emerged from a large number of projects and studies SUNY Cortland had engaged in since 1996. These projects are summarized in Appendix A.
The Steering Committee worked through early Fall 2000 developing the self-study design and, following approval of the design by Middle States in October 2000, a call was issued in the College Bulletin for volunteers to serve on the work groups that would focus on the seven emphasis areas, with more than 70 faculty and staff responding. Most work groups also added student members. Responsibility for the comprehensive portion of the self-study was assigned to the College’s four vice presidents, four associate vice presidents, two academic deans, and Director of Graduate Studies and Outreach. These individuals coordinated the self-study within their respective areas, and members of two standing committees at the College – the Educational Policy Committee (EPC) and Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) – were asked to participate based on their knowledge of the institution’s mission and strategic planning process. A Steering Committee member was added as a liaison to each of the work groups and the EPC and LRPC, which worked collaboratively throughout the process.

In November 2000 an open meeting was held for volunteers. President Taylor, Dr. Francis, and Dr. Hendrick explained the reaccreditation process and reviewed the timeline for the self-study. Shortly thereafter, all work group chairs as well as the EPC and LRPC received detailed charges developed by the Steering Committee to guide their deliberations. The Steering Committee also provided charges to individuals conducting the comprehensive portion of the self-study, who in turn requested reports from units they supervised that addressed a set of specific questions developed by the Steering Committee. Similarly, academic deans administered a special questionnaire created by the Steering Committee to all academic department and program heads. Charges developed by the Steering Committee stemmed in large part from Designs for Excellence: Handbook for Institutional Self-Study, Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education and Framework for Outcomes Assessment, but were also based on information that had emerged from the projects and studies summarized in Appendix A. All charge materials, including the department questionnaire, are available for review in the College’s Middle States Office.

The self-study took place primarily from November 2000 through May 2001. During that time, the Steering Committee reviewed and provided feedback on a draft report from each of the work groups, the EPC and LRPC working together, and each individual responsible for conducting the comprehensive portion of the self-study. Final reports were due by the end of May, and the Steering Committee spent Summer 2001 reviewing and editing these reports, with the highest priority given to reports written by the work groups and the EPC and LRPC since these reports reflected the collaborative efforts of so many different individuals from across campus. The first week of the Fall 2001 semester, the Steering Committee held a luncheon for working group chairs and chairs of the EPC and LRPC.
LRPC, updating these persons on the status of the self-study and informing them of plans for Fall 2001. During the next three weeks, edited reports were provided to chairs of the working groups, EPC, and LRPC, and Dr. Hendrick and Dr. Francis met individually with these chairpersons to review the reports to ensure that, despite editing, the documents reflected the spirit and intent of the groups’ work. Chairpersons then shared the reports with their work groups and committees and wrote memos to the Steering Committee endorsing the reports. In some cases, modifications to the edited documents were made based on feedback from the work groups, EPC, and LRPC. All draft reports, Steering Committee feedback, and responses from working groups are available for review in the Middle States Office.

Throughout the remainder of the Fall 2001 semester, the Steering Committee edited reports from administrators and began compiling chapters into the final draft report. In early December this draft report was distributed to the campus community, both in hard copy and on the College’s Middle States web page (http://www.cortland.edu/administration/middlestates/index.html), and feedback and comments invited. Early in the Spring 2002 term, the Steering Committee provided a formal report to the College’s Faculty Senate on the self-study and its recommendations, sponsored two open meetings for discussion and input, and held a sandwich seminar for the same purposes. Information was taken from these sessions and incorporated into the final report, submitted to Middle States in mid-February.

As this description suggests, the self-study process at SUNY Cortland has been open and participatory. In fact, President Taylor encouraged participation by announcing in October 2000 that involvement in accreditation efforts like Middle States would receive special weighting in awarding discretionary salary increases for the 2000-01 academic year. The Steering Committee held four sandwich seminars at different points of the process, made several reports to the Faculty Senate, submitted articles regularly to the College Bulletin and President’s Update on the status of the self-study, and maintained the Middle States web page that informed the campus community as well as external constituents about the process.

The College also interacted closely with the Middle States Association throughout the reaccreditation process. In October 2000 Dr. George Santiago of the Middle States office visited campus to review progress on the self-study and to approve the self-study design. Dr. Arnold Speert, President of William Paterson University in New Jersey and chair of the evaluation team scheduled to visit Cortland in March 2002, made his preliminary visit to campus on October 24-25, 2001 and provided feedback on the draft report he had received.
Already, the Middle States reaccreditation process has served its most important function, that of intense and reflective self-analysis. In response to both the 1992 institutional self-study and the 1997 Periodic Review Report, evaluators commended the College for its candor in examining and critiquing itself, and the Steering Committee set a similar objective for the present review. From the outset, the committee was committed to a frank appraisal of institutional effectiveness, including in all charges the questions that needed to be asked, even when it was fairly certain that some of the answers would reveal weakness. The committee was equally certain, however, that this approach would demonstrate significant institutional strengths, especially in areas deemed weak in previous Middle States reviews.

SUNY Cortland’s institutional self-study as submitted to Middle States consists of the current volume and an accompanying volume of appended materials, including a glossary of relevant terms (Appendix L). The self-study document begins in the present volume with the executive summary and introductory chapters that describe SUNY Cortland’s accreditation history and the self-study process itself and provides an overview of the College. These chapters are followed by chapters describing the comprehensive portion of the self-study, and then by the evaluations of the seven emphasis areas. In the final chapter, all recommendations emerging from the self-study process are presented. The current volume also includes the College’s most recent Annual Institutional Profile, as required by Middle States.
OVERVIEW OF THE COLLEGE

CHAPTER 2

Service Area and Campus Characteristics

SUNY Cortland is located in a small rural city in the geographic center of New York State (see Figure 1). The College is primarily an undergraduate institution, awarding 1,174 bachelor’s degrees and 411 master’s degrees or certificates of advanced study during 2000-01 and typically enrolling 81% of its students in baccalaureate programs. SUNY Cortland continues its long and rich history as a teachers college, graduating the most teacher certification candidates in the state, and regularly ranks among the top twenty institutions in the country in this respect, ahead of much larger institutions such as Pennsylvania State University, the University of Florida, and Ohio State University.

Figure 1

Geographic Location of Cortland in New York State

The College draws almost 98% of its students from within the state, with the following areas represented as indicated in Fall 2001: Central New York (27%), Long Island (20%), Western New York (12%), and New York City (3%). Approximately 48% of the undergraduate population lives on campus with many others residing in student housing in the local community. The city of Cortland, although in proximity to Syracuse, Binghamton, and Ithaca, is relatively rural, and there is little cultural or ethnic diversity in the immediate area. The region is also economically depressed, recording a 6.9% unemployment rate for December 2001, eighth highest in the state. SUNY Cortland therefore serves as the major contributor to the economy, which is fueled otherwise largely through
agriculture and several mid-sized manufacturing firms. A 1995 study conducted by economics faculty showed that the College accounts for around $100 million dollars per year in expenditures in Cortland and the region.

In addition to the main campus, which occupies 191 acres within the Cortland city limits, the College operates three off-campus centers in support of its strong environmental education programs (see Figure 1). The primary facility is the Outdoor Education Center located at Raquette Lake in the Adirondack Mountains. This center consists of 35 buildings on approximately 500 acres. The College also runs the 33-acre Brauer Geological Field Station near Albany and the 170-acre Hoxie Gorge Nature Preserve in Cortlandville, seven miles from campus. These centers provide outstanding natural settings in which students can study the environment, and are used extensively by many academic programs for teaching and research purposes.

The College Mission Statement

SUNY Cortland developed its first mission statement in 1984 as a direct consequence of criticism received from Middle States in 1982 for not having such a statement in place. In 1998, the College significantly revised its existing mission statement in an attempt to emphasize its unique niche relative to other SUNY university colleges, to better reflect its programmatic strengths, and to express more strongly its institutional priorities as well as its aspirations for students. This mission statement is found in Appendix B.

The College’s Academic Programs

Undergraduate degree programs at the College require the completion of 124-128 credit hours and lead to a Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, or Bachelor of Science in Education. All undergraduate students who enroll at the College as freshmen must complete its General Education Program’s Knowledge Base (28-29 credit hours) and Skills Base, which consists of six hours of academic writing, six hours of writing intensive courses, and 3-4 credits in courses that meet its quantitative skill requirement. Bachelor of Arts candidates must also take up to 13 hours of one foreign language while Bachelor of Science candidates in the early childhood, childhood, adolescence, or special education programs must complete the second semester of a college-level foreign language sequence. All other degree candidates must complete a one-semester college-level foreign language course. All students may meet their foreign language requirement by confirming proficiency commensurate with their degree through a testing program approved by the College’s International Communications and Culture Department. Freshmen beginning in Fall 2000 and transfer students beginning in Fall 2002 must also satisfy SUNY’s General Education Program, as described in Chapter 14, which may require the completion of additional coursework.
Students who transfer into SUNY Cortland with a completed A.A. or A.S. degree from an accredited institution are waived from the Knowledge Base of the College’s General Education Program, but must fulfill the Skills Base requirements either through transfer of equivalent course work or completion of courses at SUNY Cortland. Transfer students who enter without an A.A. or A.S. degree or with an A.A.S. degree are required to fulfill both the Skills Base and Knowledge Base requirements of the College’s General Education Program. Up to three Knowledge Base requirements may be waived for transfer students without the A.A. or A.S. degree, depending on the number of hours accepted for transfer credit.

Most academic programs are department-based, with departments housed in either the School of Arts and Sciences or the School of Professional Studies. The School of Arts and Sciences includes the following departments: Art and art history, biological sciences, chemistry, communication studies, economics, English, geography, geology, history, international communications and culture, mathematics, performing arts, philosophy, physics, political science, psychology, and sociology/anthropology. The School of Professional Studies is comprised of these departments: Education, exercise science and sport studies, health, physical education, recreation and leisure studies, and speech pathology and audiology.

Almost all of these departments offer majors and minors as well as concentrations for students. Interdisciplinary program options are also available, including majors in African American studies, human services, and international studies, and the following minors: African American Studies, American musical theatre, Asian studies, cinema study, computer applications, environmental and outdoor education, Jewish studies, Latin American studies, Native American studies, women’s studies, and urban studies. Historically, undergraduate enrollment in the School of Professional Studies has greatly outnumbered enrollment in the School of Arts and Sciences, and for Fall 2001 the proportion of students enrolled in these two schools was 60% and 30%, respectively. (The remaining 10% were classified as pre-majors, or students who had yet to declare a major.) The most highly subscribed majors in the College by far for Fall 2001 were elementary education and physical education, both housed in professional studies. In arts and sciences, the largest majors were psychology, communication studies, and business economics.

The College awards degrees in 21 programs leading to the master’s degree, and Certification of Advanced Study (CAS) programs are offered in American civilization and culture, educational administration and supervision, and school business administration. The overwhelming majority of programs leading to the master’s degree are offered for the purpose of enabling teachers to receive their permanent certification from New York State, with only
two non-certification master’s programs, in English and history. The College also operates an off-campus graduate center, the Mohawk Valley Graduate Center located in Rome, New York. Students may enroll there for courses leading to master’s degrees in elementary education, reading, and health education, and to the CAS in educational administration and supervision. Most graduate programs require the completion of 30 credit hours, many administer a comprehensive examination, and a few require a master’s thesis or other special project. For Fall 2001, 88% of all matriculated graduate students were enrolled in a degree program housed in the School of Professional Studies.

Students

Following a 13% decline in total student enrollment from 1992 to 1996, in 1997 SUNY Cortland began to rebound, and from 1997 to 2001 showed a remarkable 22.8% increase in overall enrollment (see Figure 2). For Fall 2001 total headcount reached an all-time high of 7,742, with 5,887 undergraduates and 1,855 graduate students. Annual average full-time enrollment was 6,130 for Fall 2001. The vast majority of undergraduates (95%) are enrolled full-time, while most graduate students (84%) attend the College on a part-time basis. Approximately 59% of the undergraduate student population are female, and 70% of graduate students are female. Since 1996, students of color have accounted for 5-6% of the College’s undergraduate enrollment.

Figure 2

Total Undergraduate and Graduate Enrollment, Fall 1997 – Fall 2001

The increased enrollment enjoyed by the institution for the past five years reflects highly positive trends in virtually all enrollment management indicators. For instance, number of applications has risen consistently during that time, from 8,427 for Fall 1997 to 10,451 for Fall 2001, or 24%. Further, data from SUNY System Administration reveal that, for Fall 2000, 905 applicants indicated that SUNY Cortland was the only SUNY
institution they were applying to, a 63% increase compared to Fall 1999. As a result of its increased popularity, the College has been able to lower its acceptance rate of students considerably, from 64% to 53% in just the last two years. Similarly, yield rate of accepted students has increased gradually, from 27% in Fall 1997 to 27.9% in Fall 2001, and continuing/returning rates have also improved during that time, from 73.9% to 76.9%.

As the above information would suggest, SUNY Cortland has been able to increase enrollments substantially without lowering academic standards and, in fact, the academic profile of entering first-year students has improved steadily, as seen below in Table 1. The College’s enrollment success and higher academic profile are due in part to a significant influx of funds from the Cortland College Foundation to support both merit-based and need-based aid. Specifically, this support has increased by around $150,000 annually for the past four years, with the number of merit-based scholarships growing from 212 in 1999-00 to 275 for 2001-02 and total scholarship funding for 2001-02 amounting to $750,000. Freshmen recipients for 2001-02 of the College’s most prestigious scholarships, the Presidential Scholarships and Leadership Scholarships, averaged a high school GPA of 95 and SAT scores of 1253.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Fall 1999</th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>86.14</td>
<td>86.25</td>
<td>87.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Scores</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>1030.2</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Scores</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics on attrition, retention, and graduation show that 51.5% of freshmen enrolled in Fall 1993 had received a degree by Spring 1998, while 53.3% of those students had graduated by 1999. As is true at most institutions, the proportion of students who graduate in four years was relatively low, with only 31.6% of students entering the College in 1993 receiving their degree by 1997. In general, graduation rates for this cohort were much better for females than males after four, five, and six years. In addition, while overall graduation rates for white students approximated the total population, these rates were lower for black and Hispanic students. Specifically, four-, five-, and six-year graduation rates for black students were 26.9%, 34.6%, and 38.5%, respectively. Comparable numbers for Hispanic students were 18.8%, 43.2%, and 43.3%, respectively.

Total attrition for first-year students entering in 1993, excluding those who transferred to another institution, was 10.7% as of 1999. Attrition rates for white students entering in 1993 were 10.6%, or around the average. For black females, attrition was especially high (38.5%), while black males showed an attrition rate of only 7.7%.
Interestingly, the attrition rate for both male and female Hispanic students entering the College in 1993 was 0% as of 1999, meaning that all those students have remained at the institution, excluding those who have graduated or transferred to another college.

**Administration, Faculty and Staff, and Governance Structure**

The college administration includes a president, a provost and vice president for academic affairs, three additional vice presidents (finance and management, student affairs, institutional advancement), a dean for each of the two schools, chairpersons for each of the academic departments, and directors for each of the support and service units. The College’s present administrative structure is depicted in the organizational chart found in Appendix C.

The President’s Cabinet serves as the president’s major advisory group and consists of the vice presidents and the executive assistant to the president. The President’s Council includes all members of the President’s Cabinet as well as the two deans and the four associate vice presidents (enrollment management, information resources, finance and management, facilities management). Like all SUNY institutions, the College is governed by the SUNY Board of Trustees. A local College Council, whose members are appointed by the governor, also provides oversight.

Since 1997 there has been significant change in SUNY Cortland’s upper administration, with the appointment of two new vice presidents, including the provost and vice president for academic affairs, two new associate vice presidents, and two new deans. In addition, the dean of professional studies hired in 1998 left the College in Spring 2001 to accept a provost’s position, so that position is currently being filled on an interim basis. In January 2002 the dean of arts and sciences hired in 1997 announced that he would be leaving the College in July 2002 for a position in SUNY System Administration. Searches for the two deans’ positions are presently underway.

During Fall 2001, the College employed 247 full-time and 251 part-time faculty, 147 full-time and 31 part-time professional staff, and 25 management/confidential employees. Ninety-five percent of full-time, tenure-track faculty have earned doctorates or terminal master’s degrees. Because of a large number of recent retirements, the College has hired more than 90 new full-time faculty in the past four years. In Fall 2001, 38.9% of all full-time faculty were female and 12% were ethnic minority, while 53.7% of professional staff members were female and 6.8% ethnic minority. For management/confidential employees, 56% were female and 8% were ethnic minority.

According to the *Policies of the Board of Trustees*, the University Faculty Senate is the official agency through which the University’s faculty engage in the governance of the university. The SUNY Cortland Faculty Senate bylaws, included in the *College Handbook*, identify faculty responsibilities within the administrative and academic
structures of the College. The Senate consists of elected representatives of faculty and staff from across campus, and serves as the primary faculty governance body on campus. There is also a local chapter of the United University Professions (UUP), a statewide union representing faculty and professional staff members in SUNY. Other unions represented on campus include the Civil Service Employee Association (CSEA), the Public Employees Federation (PEF), the New York State Corrections Officers Police Benevolent Association (NYSCOPBA), Council 82, and the Graduate Student Employee Union (GSEU). These groups and their constituents are described in Appendix L.

Finances and Budget

The College’s total operating budget in 2000-01 totaled $92,325,000, and Figure 3 shows the various sources of that funding. Tuition for full-time in-state students was $3,400 per year, an amount that has not increased since 1995. Out-of-state residents pay $8,300 in tuition. Tuition for full-time in-state and out-of-state graduate students is $5,100 and $8,416, respectively. Undergraduate students also pay $724 in mandatory fees per year; this fee covers a Student Activity Assessment ($179), a College Fee ($25), an Athletic Fee ($220), a Health Fee ($150), and a Technology Fee ($150). Mandatory fees have increased by 50% since 1996-97, when they were $484.

Since the late 1980’s, SUNY institutions have experienced a precipitous drop in state funding, with the percentage of SUNY Cortland’s non-capital operating budget covered by tax dollars declining from 67% in 1989-90 to 39% in 1999-2000. In addition, although the College’s operating budget increased from $15.2 million in 1978-79 to $32.7 million in 1999-2000 in terms of actual dollars, in fact there was an 18% decrease when controlling for inflation over that time.

Figure 3

Sources of Funding, 2000-01 Budget (in millions of dollars)
The academic programs of the College are administered through the School of Professional Studies and the School of Arts and Sciences, with each school supervised by a dean who reports to the provost and vice president for academic affairs. Each dean also supervises a number of interdisciplinary programs, and the dean of professional studies oversees several support and service units as well. The provost and vice president for academic affairs has oversight for a number of administrative offices and several support and service units.

In order to gather information for the institutional self-study, the provost and academic deans utilized a combination of surveys, charge questions, and other materials developed by the Middle States Steering Committee, and received reports from the program and unit heads reporting directly to them. Most of the present chapter is based on that information. In this chapter, a description and analysis of the provost’s office that focus on all-college academic issues is presented, followed by information from the two schools and those administrative and service units that report to the provost.

PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Description

Brief History and Description

The provost and vice president for academic affairs is the College’s chief academic officer. The provost is a member of the President’s Cabinet, and assumes the responsibilities of chief executive in the president’s absence. The provost oversees academic staff recruitment, retention, and promotion as well as the academic budget, and provides overall leadership in advancing the College’s academic plan. The Office of the Provost has broad and diverse responsibilities such as developing and maintaining academic standards and policies within the College, coordinating budget requests from the College’s academic units, reviewing and approving all curriculum changes, and recommending to the president decisions in all personnel matters, including the replacement and creation of faculty lines. Positions reporting directly to the provost include the dean of arts and sciences, the dean of professional studies, the associate vice president for enrollment management, the associate vice president for information resources, the director of graduate studies and outreach, the director of institutional research and assessment, the director of sponsored programs, the director of the Center for Environmental and Outdoor
Education, the director of international programs, the coordinator of the Honors Program, the coordinator of the Center for Advancement of Technology in Education, and, effective Fall 2001, the coordinator of the Center for Multicultural and Gender Studies (CMGS). Most of these units are discussed in this chapter with the exception of enrollment management, which is described in Chapter 4, and the CMGS, included in Chapter 10.

While the Office of the Provost has existed for most of the College’s history, the units and offices reporting to that office have changed frequently, even since the last Middle States review in 1997. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment was created in 1998 and started reporting directly to the provost when the previous director of institutional research/registrar retired and the College made the commitment to provide more support for assessment. In an earlier configuration, the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) coordinated several campus program events, such as commencement and Scholar’s Day, in addition to overseeing grant activity. When the former director retired in 1999, the College eliminated campus special events from the office, thereby allowing it to concentrate on its primary mission. In July 2000, the College approved the creation of the position of director of the Center for Environmental and Outdoor Education to oversee all operations of the College’s outdoor and environmental education facilities, with the previous director responsible only for the Raquette Lake facility. The Office of Graduate Studies and Outreach was created and a director appointed during Spring 2001 partly in response to the 60% increase in graduate enrollments from 1997-2001, resulting in the highest graduate student enrollment in SUNY Cortland’s history. In Fall 2001, as a direct result of the Middle States self-study process, the CMGS coordinator, who previously reported to the dean of arts and sciences, began reporting to the provost to reflect that organization’s all-college focus and to raise its visibility across campus.

The provost meets regularly with all individuals reporting directly to that office. The Provost’s Cabinet, which includes the provost, the two deans, and the associate vice presidents, meets biweekly, as does the Academic Affairs Council consisting of the Provost’s Cabinet and all others reporting to the provost. The provost also holds weekly meetings with the deans, associate vice presidents, and several directors.

Faculty

As described in other chapters in this document, the College is experiencing a dramatic transition in faculty, with many of those hired to teach in the 1960’s and 1970’s deciding to retire. In the past four years, there has been a 54% turnover in full-time faculty. Strong student enrollment growth during this same period, however, has prevented the College from making targeted improvements in the overall proportion of full-time to part-time faculty,
and for 2001-02 full-timers make up around half of the total faculty. Because many part-timers only teach one or two courses, however, the percentage of course sections being taught by full-time faculty relative to part-timers is much better, 67%. A chief objective in the College’s long range planning process and its Memorandum of Understanding with System Administration is to hire enough full-time faculty to ensure that at least 80% of all courses in a given semester are taught by a full-timer, and both schools have prepared plans that will allow them to achieve this goal.

SUNY Cortland recognizes teaching as the primary responsibility of faculty. Prior to 2001-02, President Taylor categorized expectations for Discretionary Salary Increases (DSI) to reflect 40% teaching, 40% scholarship and 20% service. For 2001-02, the president announced that each category would be weighted 33 1/3% to reflect the inordinate amount of work faculty are doing to meet external certification demands. Reappointment of tenure-track faculty requires the review of faculty with respect to factors like subject mastery, teaching effectiveness, scholarly activity, service, continuing growth, and advisement. Although college policies do not stipulate the degree to which these activities should be weighted in personnel decisions, teaching effectiveness clearly takes priority when several factors are taken into account. First, release time for research is limited to assure that full-time faculty teach classes. Second, scholarship in some departments includes curriculum development that informs teaching. Finally, most college programs are in teacher education, within which pedagogy plays a significant role.

The College’s faculty are appropriately prepared in terms of academic qualifications, with a terminal degree required for full-time, tenure-track employment. Chapter 5 includes a detailed description of these qualifications. The reappointment and tenure process ensures stringent and periodic reviews of faculty by their peers in academic departments and at the school level as well as by administrators at higher levels of evaluation. Faculty seeking promotion must provide evidence of accomplishments in scholarship, teaching, and service appropriate to the rank desired, and those applying for discretionary salary increases must include evaluative evidence of teaching effectiveness. Further, throughout their career at SUNY Cortland faculty must assess their teaching on a regular basis following the College’s course-teacher evaluation procedures.

Academic Policies

Academic affairs at the College are prescribed by personnel and curriculum policies most of which are articulated in the College Handbook. This document also contains a detailed description of the structure and functions of the College’s primary governance body, the Faculty Senate, whose Educational Policy Committee must
review and approve matters related to educational policy and major curricular changes. Further, an independent group, the College Curriculum Review Committee, has responsibility for considering and recommending to the provost curricular changes that affect both schools. Additional policies have been developed collaboratively with the provost and the deans regarding issues such as funding for faculty travel. Each academic department and interdisciplinary center also has its own policies and procedures for personnel and curriculum matters that can vary across units, although they must be consistent with college-wide policies. The Faculty Senate’s Faculty Affairs Committee must review and approve unit-based personnel policy changes. Finally, academic policies of most interest to students and relevant to issues such as program requirements, course descriptions, and definitions of good academic standing are covered comprehensively in the College Catalog, generally published on a biennial basis.

Analysis

Assessment Activities

As called for as part of the College’s assessment program described in Chapter 9, all units reporting to the provost have detailed assessment plans in place. This program is part of President Taylor’s effort to build a “culture of improvement” throughout the campus. Through December 2001, 24 academic programs and 13 administrative offices or support and service units in academic affairs had presented their assessment results to the President’s Cabinet, with only a handful left to make their presentations in Spring 2002. Beginning in 2001-02, academic programs will have to meet the guidelines of SUNY System Administration’s newly reinvigorated program review process, and five programs are already scheduled for review for this academic year.

Undoubtedly the most significant example of college-wide assessment of an academic program involves the General Education Program. While external reviewers of the College’s 1997 Periodic Review Report for Middle States commended SUNY Cortland for several positive changes in this program since the 1992 institutional self-study, they also concluded that “work is still needed to improve the assessment tools currently being employed, since they seem to measure student perceptions rather than learning outcomes.”

The College took this observation to heart, conducting three comprehensive learning outcomes-based evaluations of its General Education Program, with these efforts being led by SUNY Cortland’s General Education Committee (GEC) and the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA). Beginning in Spring 1999, essay questions were solicited from faculty teaching in each of the General Education Program’s eight categories, and the GEC chose one question per category for administration. For that semester, faculty teaching general
education courses were asked to assign the appropriate essay question to their classes on a take-home basis, with students given the standardized instruction to “spend around 50 minutes” on the essay. Essays were collected at the next class meeting and sent to OIRA for processing. This first effort yielded 4,809 essays from 140 course sections, 15% of which were selected randomly for scoring. Then, for each essay a group of faculty developed two 6-point scoring rubrics (with higher scores indicating better-quality answers), one targeting overall quality (OEQ) and the other focused on the extent to which the answer reflected mastery of the category goals and objectives (GAO). Scoring was accomplished by paying a stipend to faculty volunteers to attend a weekend retreat at the College’s Raquette Lake facility. This retreat included a norming session to train scorers, after which each essay was scored by two independent readers, with rating disagreements of more than one point reconciled by an arbitrator. Similar procedures were followed in Spring 2000 and 2001, although essays were administered in class and faculty given their choice of two questions to assign.

Overall results of the general education assessment process have been largely favorable. First, inter-rater agreement has been remarkably high, with reliability estimates for the OEQ rubric being within one point for 97.5% of the 3,319 total essays. These estimates for the scoring of the GAO rubric have been 96.2% overall. In addition, the OIRA conducted a validity study of the Spring 1999 scores, finding that the general education essay scores predicted a small but significant proportion of the variance in participating students’ GPA.

With respect to student performance on the essays, results are mixed. Overall, average student performance has been right around a score of “3,” with students demonstrating somewhat higher GAO scores compared to OEQ scores. It is also clear that students are doing better in some categories than others. Specifically, scores in the GE1 (American State and Society) and GE3 (Contrasting Cultures) groupings are significantly higher than in the other categories, and scores in the GE4 (Fine Arts) and GE7 (Science, Technology and Human Affairs) categories are significantly lower in most cases. A complete report summarizing the outcomes of this three-year general education assessment process can be accessed at http://cortland.edu/oir/GEcatrvw/GE_categrev.html.

The College has made significant progress in general education assessment the last three years in terms of faculty participation, the collegial fashion in which these efforts have taken place, and important statistical indicators like sampling and reliability and validity estimates. Future challenges include determining how satisfied faculty should be with the performance data collected to date, developing strategies for improving performance, and assessing the program’s Skills Base, with efforts to date focusing almost exclusively on its Knowledge Base. Also,
as detailed in Chapter 14, like all other SUNY schools SUNY Cortland must now adapt its general education assessment program to meet the requirements of the SUNY Assessment Initiative scheduled to begin Fall 2002. At present faculty work groups are meeting regularly under the guidance of the provost and the dean of arts and sciences to develop a plan for meeting these requirements, to be submitted to System Administration in March 2002.

Information Literacy

Closely related to the issue of outcomes assessment are the five information literacy competency standards emphasized by Middle States, and these standards are in fact addressed in a variety of ways throughout SUNY Cortland’s curriculum. These standards are explicitly expressed in the All-College Student Learning Goal, discussed in detail in Chapter 9, as well as in the goals and objectives of the eight general education categories as stated in the College Catalog. Further, virtually every academic program has identified learning goals and objectives in its assessment plan that relate closely to the information literacy standards.

More specifically, the general education categories encompass the major substance of the standards, ranging from critical thinking, the organization of written material, mathematical competency, sensitivity to various literary forms, research methods, the nature and value of scientific experimentation, and consideration of the ethical and broad social impact of contemporary technology and science. Several standards, such as the use of library resources, are included in COR 101: The First-Year Experience. While different disciplines emphasize different standards in their courses, in every case students are challenged beyond the basic levels offered in general education.

Faculty Workload

A number of factors contribute to the perception that faculty workload is distributed inequitably across the College and, more specifically, between the two schools. Major among these is the fact that student enrollment in academic majors is so disproportionately concentrated in the School of Professional Studies, especially education and physical education. In addition, historically, professional studies faculty were typically assigned twelve credit hours per semester compared to nine in arts and sciences. Finally, the College’s department-based advisement system results in most professional studies faculty having many more advisees than faculty in the other school.

An objective examination of this issue makes it difficult to conclude definitively that school-based inequities in workload exist, at least with respect to teaching duties. Since Fall 1999, with the creation of a new student data warehouse coupled with the new BANNER 2000 student information system, it has been possible to merge data from multiple sources, enabling the administration to better monitor and understand the teaching load situation
across the College. For Fall 2000 the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment published a detailed report on this situation, revealing the following:

- 69% of students who had declared a major were in a professional studies major, compared to 31% in arts and sciences;

- 61% of total student credit hours were generated in arts and sciences, compared to 39% in professional studies;

- 59% of the FTE faculty at Cortland were in the school of arts and sciences, compared to 41% in professional studies; and,

- Average advisee loads for faculty were 12 in arts and sciences departments, compared to 28 in professional studies departments.

Teaching loads as indicated by number of 3-credit course sections per semester do generally vary across the two schools, with full-time faculty in professional studies typically assigned 7-8 sections per academic year compared to six in arts and sciences. Some departments in arts and sciences, however, do teach 7-8 sections per year (e.g., English, mathematics). In addition, as the data above reveal, arts and sciences accounts for significantly more credit hours generated, due to the fact that this school offers most of the general education courses all students must take as well as many service courses required for professional studies majors. Average class size in arts and sciences is typically bigger as well. Finally, what appears on the surface to be school-based differences in workload are more appropriately viewed as department-based differences. Specifically, education and physical education have historically carried the College in many respects, including other departments in both schools.

Despite the absence of empirical support for the impression that professional studies faculty have heavier teaching loads, it is clear that these faculty perceive this impression as true, as noted below in their dean’s report. This situation has been exacerbated by pressures resulting from accreditation and certification efforts, although much of this work has been compensated through extra service funds. In addition, the disparity overall between schools in terms of number of advisees is obvious and contributes greatly to the time and energy some professional studies faculty expend in this aspect of their jobs.

Acknowledging these problems, the College has already made a number of changes. Beginning in Fall 2001 sufficient resources were allocated to enable education faculty to move from a 4-4 course load per year to a 4-3 load and to create four assistant chair positions to improve advising and overall support for the chairperson. Further, temporary service funds have been allocated to hire extra student advisors for education majors. In Fall 2000 physical education was divided into two departments, physical education and exercise science and sport studies, in
an attempt to distribute students and workload across more units. President Taylor has also expressed his intent to rely more on number of credit hours generated as opposed to number of course sections taught as a measure of teaching load. This approach could give departments more leeway in offering fewer course sections with more students in each class when appropriate pedagogically.

Overall, the College’s efforts to monitor and study teaching loads will be greatly enhanced by recent efforts undertaken by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Specifically, this office began to implement a Faculty Load module expansion in late Fall 2001, which records many elements of faculty human resources data in a dynamic table-based system that is integrated with the College’s BANNER 2000 system. In addition to making it possible to maintain human resources data more reliably than in the past, this action will enable the College to track and assess faculty work responsibilities beyond teaching, to include scholarship and research activity, college service, and release time data. With this capability, the provost, deans, and department chairs will have better and more timely access to workload reports for planning and decision-making.

Academic Affairs Structure and Support

As easily seen from SUNY Cortland’s organizational chart in Appendix C, the provost and vice president for academic affairs is responsible for a disproportionately high number of units in the College, an almost impossible structure given the fact that there is no associate provost position as there is at many comparable colleges. Although this situation is problematic for several reasons, its implications are most critical in terms of institutional mission and providing academic vision for the future. Specifically, the present structure requires the provost to expend virtually all available time and energy overseeing daily responsibilities such as monitoring budgets, providing curricular management, reviewing and approving position requests, and supervising the College’s academic policy process. Higher education today, however, requires academic leaders to transcend the mere management of current operations, to be able to keep abreast of the breathtaking advances in areas such as technology and information management, to communicate institutional needs and priorities persuasively to faculty, to deal effectively and persistently with often cumbersome bureaucratic governance and curriculum structures, and to provide a creative and innovative plan for the future while at the same time preserving core values and traditions.

In short, it is clear that a provost must be the academic leader of the campus, not just a good manager. Given the current structure of SUNY Cortland’s academic affairs division and lack of adequate administrative support, however, it is difficult if not impossible for the provost to be this leader. In recognition of this situation, in Summer
2001 the President’s Cabinet approved the creation of an associate provost position, which was to be filled during 2001-02. The recent statewide budget crisis resulting from the September 11 national disaster, however, has made it necessary to freeze that position for the immediate future. In the interim, the associate vice president for enrollment management will assist the provost in the areas of curriculum and budget management.

Resources and Budget Process

Overall, units reporting to the provost are fairly well staffed and most have adequate physical space. However, many of these offices report insufficient funds to fully support their operations. Particularly lacking is funding to provide adequate travel or professional development opportunities or to absorb the cost of acquiring and maintaining essential technologies. Not surprisingly, those offices that collect fees for their programs and services (e.g., information resources, international programs) are more financially healthy than those that do not. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment has had an especially difficult time performing its functions within the constraints of its operating budget, in part because of its survey administration and analysis services, and as a result each year the provost has to cover some of this office’s expenses. Similarly, graduate studies and outreach has almost no funding for travel and professional development, although this office’s inadequate office situation did significantly improve recently with its move to Brockway Hall.

Another issue related to resources and the budget involves the College’s highly centralized budget process. In recent years, virtually all major funding decisions related to purchases, the filling of full-time replacement positions, and the creation of new positions have been made at the President’s Cabinet level. This system was implemented in the mid-1990’s as a result of the steep enrollment decline and subsequent budget crisis, making it necessary to pull resources in to the greatest degree possible. While appropriate at the time, the College should now consider implementing a more decentralized process for several reasons. First, enrollment gains and other efforts have helped create a more stable resource base, making it less necessary to maintain tight fiscal controls. Second, involvement of the President’s Cabinet in what are often minor budget decisions is not a good use of that group’s time. Third, requiring that group’s approval for all major budget decisions is inefficient and time-consuming, and can lead to delays in hiring qualified personnel. Finally, both deans have advocated strongly for budget decentralization on the basis that the current system disempowers them in vital ways, especially in areas related to filling or replacing positions and negotiating salaries for new faculty. In response to these arguments, in Summer 2001 the President’s
Cabinet approved a plan for phasing in decentralization of budget control. This new plan also allows more campus involvement in the budget process, with all units submitting budget requests in October for the next academic year.

SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES

Description

Description and Brief History

The School of Professional Studies includes six academic departments (education, exercise science and sport studies, health, physical education, recreation and leisure studies, and speech pathology and audiology) as well as the Athletics Department, the Office of Field Studies, the Center for Wellness, the Center for International Education, and the Migrant Educational Opportunity Program. Over the last five years there have been many changes in the school, most notably significant turnover in leadership at the dean and department chair levels. In 1997 the individual who had served as dean for 13 years retired, and, after one year of an interim dean, a new dean was hired in 1998 along with new department chairs in education and recreation and leisure studies. At present there is an interim dean again, with the person hired in 1998 leaving in Spring 2001 to accept a provost’s position at another institution. For 2000-01, only one individual who was a department chair in 1997 was still in that position. Structural changes have also been substantial, with the large physical education department divided in Fall 2000 into two units, physical education (PE) and exercise science and sport studies (ESSS). Coincidentally, at the same time coaches, who had been faculty in the PE department, were reassigned as professionals reporting to the athletic director under provisions of the newly negotiated UUP contract.

The dean of professional studies provides leadership and general management for the school, with an associate dean, a staff assistant to the deans who is shared with the School of Arts and Sciences, three secretaries, and an account clerk who monitors athletic revenues and expenditures. The dean also serves as unit head for the College’s teacher education program, a role only recently assumed when the College decided to seek NCATE accreditation. During 2000-01, the associate dean of arts and sciences supported the dean with work towards NCATE accreditation and NYSED reregistry. Until Spring 2001 a faculty member received release time to provide oversight for the school’s graduate programs, with assistance from a half-time keyboard specialist. At this time, partly due to the growth in graduate enrollments, a director of graduate studies position was created and filled, and that person assigned responsibility for graduate programs across the College.
School Mission

In Fall 1998 the School of Professional Studies adopted a “Vision of Excellence” which asserted its intention “to be the premier school of its type, which integrates liberal arts and sciences, theory and application in the professional disciplines.” Toward this end, units in the school were charged with enhancing their academic programs and addressing key concerns that influence program quality in their annual reports. The dean provides an overview of annual and long-range goals to new faculty at orientation and to all faculty, administrators and staff during an annual “All-School Meeting.” President Taylor and the provost are invited to attend these meetings at which unit heads summarize outcomes from the previous year and goals for the next year.

Enrollment

As student enrollment at SUNY Cortland continues to grow, so do the number and percentage of students in professional studies, with around 60% of all undergraduates and 75% of all graduate students typically enrolled in its programs. These increases have strained the education, PE, and ESSS departments, forcing them to impose enrollment caps or minimum grade point average standards to help reduce their size. As seen in Table 2, the largest growth has occurred in education, with undergraduate and graduate enrollment increasing by 46% and 78%, respectively, from 1996 to 2001. Enrollments in PE (including ESSS in 2000 and 2001) have increased significantly as well, with the new majors in athletic training and sport management, both housed in ESSS, accounting for most of that growth. Another factor is the increase in number of transfer students, since a large percentage of these students tend to major in a professional studies program. This change results in additional pressure on department course offerings, since transfer students generally have major requirements to fulfill for the most part.

Table 2

Student Enrollment by Department Within Professional Studies, 1996 - 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSS</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLS</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>2898</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>3044</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Prior to Fall 2000, PE enrollments included ESSS enrollments. Also, totals include wait list students beginning in 1998.
With respect to remaining departments, recreation and leisure studies experienced healthy growth through 1999, with an unexpected decline in undergraduate enrollment in 2000 and an even larger drop in 2001. Graduate enrollment, however, has almost tripled in that department over the last four years. Similarly, undergraduate enrollment in health has declined while graduate enrollment increased by 60% between 1996-2001, and it is expected that graduate enrollment will grow even more as a result of the new Master of Science in Teaching (MST) program. The decline in speech pathology and audiology reflects a number of factors, including an increase in GPA required for admission into the program, the institution of a competency exam, and the fact that SUNY Cortland lacks a graduate program in this field. For Fall 2000, recreation and leisure studies, health, and speech pathology and audiology implemented supplemental strategies for in an attempt to attract more undergraduate students. These efforts were negated, however, when an influx of freshmen enrolled in PE and education, necessitating an overall reduction of transfer students, who often declare majors in these three departments.

Faculty. As described in Chapter 5, there has been a 45% increase in full-time faculty in professional studies over the last five years. While this change is extremely positive, the 24% increase in part-time faculty during that time reflects the continued role these individuals play in absorbing the growth in student enrollment and in supervising student teachers, especially in education and PE. Health has also experienced a significant increase in part-time faculty. In other words, even the considerable increase in full-time faculty has failed to keep pace with student enrollment. At least in part, this situation exists because departments have been unable to fill tenure-track positions in highly competitive fields (e.g., for Fall 2001 approximately 30 full-time faculty positions were unfilled).

A relevant observation is the fact that since 1998 department chairs have advocated for more competitive salaries and the use of the master’s degree as a terminal degree for clinical faculty positions, especially for speech pathology and audiology and the athletic training program housed in ESSS. During the 1999-00 academic year, new full-time lines were created in speech pathology and audiology for faculty that permitted long-term contracts and the master’s degree, and in Summer 2001 two athletic training faculty lines were similarly converted. Further, some part-time positions in a number of departments were converted to full-time lecturer lines with a positive impact on morale. A more complete description of this conversion process is found in Chapter 5.

Facilities and space. Due to the rapid growth in enrollment and the hiring of more faculty, professional studies at present has insufficient space to accommodate its faculty. In Fall 2000 the new ESSS department moved to Studio West, which has provided some relief, and recently some new offices were constructed for education faculty.
Still, faculty in education are spread across two buildings, the adjoined Cornish/Van Hoesen complex, which is in such need of upgrading that it is included in the capital plan as the number one campus priority. Conducting a program study of the Moffett Center, in which the health department resides, is second on the priority list. Recreation and leisure studies is housed in the Park Center between PE and the Athletics Department, with little room for expansion, while speech pathology and audiology is located off-campus in a building that is without direct phone connections to campus. At present the College’s Facilities Office is working on a plan that would create additional office space for new professional studies faculty.

Academic Programs

Education. Due to NYSED reregistry, the Education Department has completely transformed existing programs and increased its total number of programs. Five years ago, the department offered undergraduate programs in elementary N-6 and N-9, master’s programs in elementary education and reading, and a CAS certificate program. Since 1998, the department has introduced new programs in special education, early childhood, and the MST. The elementary program is now referred to as childhood (1 to 6) and the reading program is now referred to as literacy. The department has spent significant time rewriting all of its programs and developing new ones to meet revised state regulations. This rewriting has resulted in changes in academic criteria for entry into majors, the development of seminars attached to student teaching, and the infusion of literacy and technology throughout the curriculum. The department is now considering performance assessment strategies and is developing portfolio assessments.

Exercise science and sport studies. The newly-created ESSS department provides visibility to non-teaching physical education majors within areas such as athletic training and sport management, both of which were upgraded from a minor and a concentration, respectively, to major programs in 2000. The formation of this new unit also generated the development of new programs in kinesiology - fitness development and kinesiology with concentrations in exercise science and in sport studies, approved by SUNY System Administration in Spring 2001. A new master’s degree in exercise science was submitted to SUNY in 1998, a master’s degree is also being proposed in sport management, and an articulation is planned with a master’s degree program at the University of North London’s Business School. Finally, the department is developing a bachelor’s program in coaching and a master’s program in leadership in sport. Other initiatives include collaboration with the SUNY Upstate Medical University and Syracuse University in the areas of research, educational programs for students, and faculty development.
Health. The mission of the Health Department consists of the following two components: 1) to provide professional preparation at the undergraduate and graduate levels to assist majors develop skills and competencies required for positions in a variety of health professions and for admission into advanced degree programs; and, 2) to provide health coursework to fulfill program requirements for other majors and general education.

Health programs have received extensive review and revision over the past five years. Because the scope of the health professions is so broad, the following concentrations have been developed to help students focus their interests and enhance their professional development beyond the minimum requirements of the health science degree program: Community health education, health administration and planning, environmental health, wellness/health promotion, allied health, and college health promotion and prevention services. Two new concentrations, health communication and international health, are under curriculum review. The department is also adding a master’s in science teaching program that will articulate with the PE certificate program. The market for this program is high, as it produces students who can teach both physical education and health courses.

Physical education. As a result of the reorganization that created ESSS, it is now possible for PE to focus solely on its undergraduate and graduate teacher certification programs. Major issues emerging over the past five years have included transition in leadership at the chair level, enrollment management, reorganization, and program revision due to NYSED requirements for reregistry. From 1996-2001 there were three different chairs of the department and, with the resignation of the chair in Spring 2001, yet another chair was named in Fall 2001. These leadership transitions are of concern given that PE is one of the largest and most historic majors at the College.

Since Fall 1995 a record number of undergraduate students have entered the program, significantly affecting the number of placements available for student teaching as well as the number of supervisors required and opportunities available for observation. Reflecting revisions in NYSED regulations, the department has developed more rigorous standards and has instituted criteria for admission to the undergraduate program at earlier times to enhance students’ timely eligibility for student teaching. The department has also attempted to keep program enrollments in line with the teaching positions available in New York State. Beginning in Fall 2001 a new department assessment plan will be implemented, linked explicitly to the processes of reregistering teacher education programs and NCATE accreditation. As a result, the department has aligned program and student outcomes with state and national standards. With respect to graduate programs, graduate student enrollment has been relatively stable. Because of
NYSED registry, standards have risen slightly, with an entry-level GPA of 2.5 now required. In addition, graduate students will have to maintain a 3.0 GPA to remain in the program.

Recreation and leisure studies. The department offers a B.S. in recreation with concentrations in management of leisure services, therapeutic recreation, leisure/recreation program delivery, and outdoor recreation management and education. The department also grants the M.S. and M.S.Ed. in recreation education. The B.S.E. was recently deactivated with the consent of NYSED.

Major revisions in curriculum have occurred since 1998, including the following: 1) the development of a new concentration in outdoor recreation management and education; 2) strengthening the therapeutic recreation concentration and the leisure/recreation programming concentration; 3) upgrading internship requirements, including the addition of a professional experience requirement prior to internship eligibility; 4) revising the core curriculum; and, 5) instituting portfolio advisement. The department has also added several one-credit outdoor recreation activity courses, is starting a campus-wide outdoor pursuits program, and is planning to transform its four undergraduate concentrations to majors.

Key areas of concern in the department include inadequate facilities and space to meet departmental requirements and the need for aggressive assistance from the Admissions Office to develop strategies for recruiting undergraduate students to the major. In addition, the department also sees a need for the College to develop strategies that result in stronger support for faculty who conduct research and enhance faculty retention.

Speech pathology and audiology. The department offers undergraduate programs in speech pathology and audiology for teacher certification and in speech and hearing science. The pre-professional program includes academic courses and clinical experiences for initial certification in New York State as a teacher of students with speech and language disabilities, as well as the competencies to pursue graduate study. The department’s assessment plan includes program and outcomes measures that meet NYSED standards and expectations for the American Speech Language and Hearing Association (ASHA) and state licensing. In 1998 the department completed a self-study comparing its programs to a representative sample of peer programs in New York State. As at other institutions, SUNY Cortland’s program offers foundation courses that prepare students for graduate study and begin the process for ASHA certification. Differences were also revealed, however, with SUNY Cortland the only institution requiring neuropathology and the only SUNY program that does not offer graduate study.
From 1998 to 2001, the department made a number of curricular revisions based on assessment and self-study findings. In 1999 the department secured a consultant to assist with a feasibility study regarding the development of a master’s degree program. In 2000, faculty began to develop a master’s program proposal to submit to SUNY System Administration and the NYSED for registry to allow students to matriculate by 2003. The development of the master’s program should stimulate an increase in undergraduate majors, since the master’s degree is required for sustained employment in the field.

Support and Service Units

Athletics. The SUNY Cortland Athletics Department is headed by an athletic director and fields 25 intercollegiate sport teams, making the College one of the largest Division III schools nationally. Since 1997 two women’s teams have been added, in golf and ice hockey. Also, in June 1997 eleven part-time coaching lines were converted to full-time positions, providing more stability to the program overall.

Other changes have occurred as well. As part of the reorganization of PE in Spring 2000, a separate Athletics Department was created, with most coaches, who had formerly been part of the PE staff, moved to athletics. One positive outcome has been the enhanced role played by the athletic director in appointing and evaluating head coaches, functions previously assigned to the PE chairperson. Still, because most coaches continue to teach to some extent, their duties include a set of expectations for appointment to assure that the qualifications of prospective coaches are consistent with the needs of the educational program. Another significant change affecting coaches was the conversion of coaches from faculty to professional staff lines, effective Fall 2001. This system-wide change, a direct result of the most recent UUP contract negotiations, required much collaboration among the dean of professional studies, athletic director, representative coaches, and human resources staff to determine the percentage of effort coaches would devote to instruction and to coaching. Resulting agreements decreased the percentage of effort devoted to instruction and created new pay scales and titles such as head coach. Three coaches who had doctorates and held positions as tenured faculty remain in this capacity, two in PE and one in ESSS.

The College’s athletic program is monitored by the Cortland Intercollegiate Athletics Board (CIAB). In recent years this group has focused on the following issues: 1) the shifting of coaches’ salaries into the athletics budget, which is generated primarily through student athletic fees; 2) limited consideration of student-athletes with regard to flexibility of course scheduling and registration when compared to students in the Honors Program; 3) the absence of recognition of athlete scholars in college-wide ceremonies; and, 4) limited attendance at contests by students,
faculty and staff. Concerns have also been raised regarding gender equity in athletics, especially by the Committee on the Status and Education of Women (CSEW), a presidentially-appointed group that has responsibility for overseeing the institution’s Title IX compliance. While this issue is examined closely in Chapter 10, it is notable that in 2000 the dean of professional studies, the athletics director and associate athletic director agreed on a strategic plan to address existing Title IX concerns. As a result, the athletics budget for 2001-02 was realigned to demonstrate equity across all teams in the assignment of assistants based on size of the team, season of the sport, and other issues such as equipment, funding for recruitment, and transportation.

Field studies. This office coordinates college-wide practica and student teaching, and is responsible for assuring that field placements adhere to state regulations and college policy. This unit also maintains a database on school placements and communicates with schools and school districts regarding placement opportunities. The office has managed over the years to find placements for all eligible students, a remarkable feat given the large number of students majoring in teacher education programs and the increase in required placement hours resulting from new state standards. Areas of concern in recent years have included inadequate staffing, accompanied by increased field requirements mandated by changes in NYSED regulations, leading to the office being allowed in Fall 2000 to hire a full-time assistant. Another problem involves a lack of clarification across the College regarding the role of various offices in arranging field placements, with internships being coordinated by field studies, the Internship Office, and individual departments, sometimes without adequate communication among units.

Analysis

Impact of NYSED/NCATE

Most academic departments in the school have been greatly affected by the processes of NYSED reregistry and NCATE accreditation, with these processes described and analyzed in detail in Chapter 14. Suffice it to say that the workload resulting from these different initiatives has been challenging for faculty who have had to review their undergraduate and graduate teacher education programs in depth and revise many courses and program requirements. Three-quarters of all the new courses developed as a result of these initiatives have been within professional studies, totaling 78 undergraduate and graduate courses. Not surprisingly, this activity has resulted in much anxiety and concern on the part of faculty, as revealed by department chairs responding to the Middle States self-study questionnaire. While few would question the fact that targeted programs have improved as a result of these processes, the effort has taken a toll on the faculty involved.
Further, meeting conditions to bring the College in line with NYSED and NCATE standards will be extremely costly. These conditions include having 80% of all course sections taught by full-time faculty, arranging 100 hours of experiences in the schools for teacher education students prior to student teaching, increasing the number of faculty with credentials in the field, and reducing teaching loads for graduate faculty and workloads for student teaching supervisors. Cost estimates of SUNY Cortland’s needs to meet these conditions have been presented to SUNY System Administration, but funds are not forthcoming. A thorough review of the implications of NYSED and NCATE certification is found in Chapter 14, including a description of the considerable resources already invested by the College in these initiatives.

Assessment Activities and Evaluation of Quality

Like all campus units, academic departments and support and service units within professional studies have developed and implemented outcomes-based assessment plans. All academic programs except for ESSS, which as a new department was scheduled to submit its plan in Fall 2001, developed and submitted their assessment plans in 1997. There is other evidence that professional studies is fulfilling its vision of excellence. During 1999-2000, recreation and leisure studies achieved reaccreditation by the Council on Accreditation of the National Recreation and Park Association. The findings of the review team indicated that the department’s curriculum met or exceeded standards set by the profession, resulting in the department being reaccredited with commendations. Similarly, athletic training achieved continuing accreditation in 2000-01 from the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs. With respect to support and service units, athletics conducted a NCAA self-study review in 2000 that was confirmed and accepted by the NCAA in Spring 2001.

Other performance indicators from 1999-2000 support the quantity and quality of activities being undertaken by professional studies faculty and staff. For instance, 91 faculty and administrators published over 131 articles, books, and book chapters and made 209 presentations to international, national, regional and statewide organizations. Secured grant funding totaled almost $1 million, and faculty in education and recreation and leisure studies won major SUNY and national teaching awards. Faculty, staff, and administrators held 98 leadership positions on boards, organizations and associations within their disciplines and served the College, school and their departments on more than 1000 committees and in co-curricular activities. Diagnostic clinics were conducted and provided service to 150 community organizations. Achievement of national ranking in the Sears Cup placed SUNY
Cortland’s athletics program within the top twenty in Division III athletics in the country, and this program remained the leader in the state, capturing the SUNYAC Commissioner’s Cup for the fourth straight year.

**Advisement**

As demonstrated by the results of the 2000 Student Opinion Survey, students’ perceptions of advisement at SUNY Cortland are generally not positive. Within professional studies, advisement loads are heavy, averaging over twice as many students as in the School of Arts and Sciences. Four out of the six departments in professional studies average over 25 students per advisor, compared to only one department in arts and sciences with an advisement load that large. Within the school, efforts to help improve advisement include offering workshops for advisors, reducing the advisement load in some departments, and developing an assessment tool to more closely examine problem areas. Education, which has one of the highest advisement loads on campus (e.g., 60 – 70 advisees on average), has hired part-time emeriti faculty and reassigned a part-time faculty member to coordinate advisement, helping ameliorate this load. As stated earlier, the four assistant chairs hired for 2001-02 are also intended to assist in this regard. The Recreation and Leisure Studies Department has initiated portfolio advisement to help students and faculty develop and organize student curriculum plans.

**Structure and Administrative Workload**

Over 20 years ago, the College included three schools, and there was also a graduate dean. Over time, largely because of declining budget allocations from New York State, the existing two schools were formed and the graduate dean position eliminated, with each school assuming responsibility for its own graduate students. In the last ten years, several committees have considered restructuring the College, most notably the Academic Reorganization Committee formed by President Taylor in Fall 1996. This committee, after examining the benefits and disadvantages of various organizational models, concluded that a six-school model with a dean for each school had the best benefit-to-disadvantage ratio, but the cost of implementation was prohibitive. Therefore, in December 1996 President Taylor announced that the College would retain its existing structure of two schools and two deans.

Reorganization remains a chief concern within professional studies, motivated by the fact that two departments are simply too large. Not only is this issue problematic for education and PE, it also affects health, recreation and leisure studies, and speech pathology and audiology adversely, with these smaller departments obscured at times by the high profile and needs of the larger ones. The recent restructuring of PE is a positive development that will likely enhance faculty recruitment and retention as well as the visibility of the undergraduate majors involved. At
the same time, education remains excessively large. Although enrollment caps were first allowed in 2000 for education’s undergraduate programs, graduate student enrollment continues to increase, giving rise to planning efforts in Fall 2001 for curtailing this growth. Still, with three new programs and responsibility for delivering on-campus as well as off-campus programs, education has reached a size and complexity that far exceed those at other SUNY campuses. To address these problems, effective Fall 2001 the President’s Cabinet approved the one-year pilot plan that includes assigning the education chairperson to a year-round obligation for extra compensation as well as appointing four assistant chairs in order to alleviate the chair’s administrative burden.

The size and complexity of the School of Professional Studies is also evidenced in the dean’s office, particularly in the workload that must be absorbed by staff members. As described earlier, this office now receives additional support from the associate dean of arts and sciences in coordinating NYSED reregistry and NCATE accreditation, and a staff assistant was brought in to assist with academic support services. Still, the dean’s workload increased significantly with the designation of this position as unit head of the College-wide teacher education program.

In summary, in light of the recent surge of new students, which has exacerbated enrollment imbalances both between schools and within professional studies, as well as the creation of the Office of Graduate Studies and Outreach, it might be timely to reconsider restructuring within the College. Unfortunately, the significant loss of revenue in New York State since September 11 precludes the addition of administrative offices at present. Instead, the institution’s major priority must be attaining its objective of having 80% of its course sections offered by full-time faculty.

Faculty Morale

Despite the heavy workload and pressures resulting from external demands, department chairpersons indicated for the most part in the self-study survey that morale in professional studies was genuinely high and in fact improving. Reasons included the ability to hire so many new, energetic faculty, clear recognition across campus of the value of teacher education programs, strong leadership in the school, the conversion of so many part-time to full-time faculty positions, and hopeful expectations of what life will be like after the NYSED and NCATE processes are successfully completed. Factors contributing to lower morale were also mentioned, and included the pressure of so many more students accompanied by the College’s inability to keep pace with resource reallocation, low faculty salaries, inadequate facilities, and perceptions that workload is inequitable across schools and that opportunities for release time to pursue scholarship are insufficient.
SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Description

Brief History and Description

The mission of the School of Arts and Sciences is to provide a sound liberal education for all students at SUNY Cortland and to offer major and minor programs in the traditional disciplines of the liberal arts and in emerging fields, including teacher certification programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels in adolescence education (formerly known as secondary education). The school was created in 1963, and in its nearly forty years of existence it has offered programs and general education through academic departments in three divisions – arts and humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences and mathematics. Specific departments have changed little over the years, with the greatest change taking place in 1996 when the theater and music departments were merged into the Performing Arts Department. The school now consists of 17 academic departments: Art and art history, biological sciences, chemistry, communication studies, economics, English, geography, geology, history, international communications and culture, mathematics, performing arts, physics, political science, psychology, social philosophy, and sociology/anthropology. The following interdisciplinary centers are also housed in arts and sciences: Aging and human services, and international education.

The school is administered by a dean, an associate dean, a half-time staff assistant, and two secretaries. During the 2000-01 academic year, and probably through Spring 2003, the staff also includes a full-time assistant dean, shared with professional studies, who was appointed to absorb the additional work resulting from NYSED certification and NCATE accreditation. Also during 2001-02, a part-time faculty member was hired to serve as interim associate dean, allowing the permanent associate dean the opportunity to lead the NYSED and NCATE efforts as associate dean of teacher certification and accreditation. Once these efforts are successfully completed, this individual will return to her associate dean position in the school.

The dean has responsibility for the overall functioning of the school, and specifically oversees the school’s departments and interdisciplinary centers, faculty, budget, curriculum, new faculty searches, hiring of adjunct faculty, and the College’s General Education Program. The associate dean, and through Spring 2003 the assistant dean, has primary responsibility for student academic matters, as well as other duties such as representing the dean’s office on committees such as the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee. The permanent associate dean, along
with overseeing the NYSED and NCATE processes, also chairs the Arts and Sciences Secondary Education Council, the body that consists of all adolescence education program directors in the school.

The dean is advised by the Arts and Sciences Chairs Council, which consists of all chairs and directors in the school, and meets with this council twice a month during the academic year. An attempt is also made to hold a school-wide faculty meeting at least once each year. There is frequent contact between the deans of both schools, both formally and informally, and the two deans co-chair the Teacher Education Council, the group on campus that has primary responsibility for setting directions and establishing policies for the College’s education programs.

School Mission

The single most significant development in the School of Arts and Sciences over the past five years with respect to its mission has been its redefinition as a school of “engaged liberal arts.” Through Fall 2000 a school-wide discussion took place regarding the character, mission and general direction of the School of Arts and Sciences, ultimately result in a document titled Learning to Make a Difference. This document included analysis of the problems the school had been facing, particularly low enrollments in many programs, and possible reasons for those problems. Also included was a revised mission that focuses on the values of liberal higher education in relation to broader social and international contexts as well as the career interests of current and prospective students. Discussed in department meetings and in a school-wide faculty meeting in November 2000, the document was revised and submitted with general faculty support to President Taylor for his approval.

Among the more significant and far-reaching new initiatives called for in Learning to Make a Difference is SUNY Cortland’s First Programs, which are thematic learning communities for first-semester freshmen. The Fall 2001 First Programs offerings were Tech First and People First, and two others, Community First and World First, are being planned for Fall 2002. Eventually, the goal is to create enough first programs for each fall semester to accommodate all freshmen arts and sciences students as well as freshmen pre-majors, with the unique learning environment of these programs serving as the school’s distinctive appeal for prospective students.

Directly related to the school’s revised mission, and providing significant support for it, is the $1.75 million Title III grant received by the College. This grant, which focuses almost exclusively on increasing enrollments in arts and sciences, is in its second year in 2001-02. Activities include the development of new majors in new communications media, new graphic design media, geographic information systems, and water resources. In addition, faculty development opportunities are being offered in instructional technology, the use of the College’s
outdoor education facilities in teaching, and the development and teaching of learning communities. The new major programs, detailed below, all reflect the emphasis on engaged liberal arts, as do the faculty development projects. A final component of the Title III grant is aimed directly at addressing persistent problems with student advisement, revealed through SUNY’s Student Opinion Survey. This component includes strategies for strengthening advisement in the school, with an ancillary goal to use advisement to increase the probability that pre-major students declare a major in arts and sciences.

Enrollment and Credit Hours Generated

In Fall 2001 there were 1,761 undergraduate students majoring in arts and sciences programs. Appendix D shows undergraduate enrollment by program since 1996 for liberal arts programs, including breakdowns between liberal arts and teacher certification programs. For Fall 2001 students in teacher preparation programs (including those wait-listed for Adolescence Education Programs) accounted for around 25.6% of the school’s overall undergraduate enrollment.

While the table in Appendix D shows a 4% enrollment decline in non-teacher certification enrollments over time, certification programs have helped the school realize a slight increase in overall enrollment. It is also important to note that arts and sciences generates more than 60% of total student credit hours, far more than are indicated by number of majors. This situation results because the bulk of general education courses are taught in arts and sciences, as are numerous required courses for programs in professional studies. For instance, biology teaches the required Anatomy and Physiology course for physical education and exercise science and sport studies as well as similar required courses for health majors, psychology offers a wide range of required courses for elementary education students, and all elementary education students must take a variety of liberal arts courses, as well as a minor in a liberal arts discipline, all of which is provided by arts and sciences departments.

Appendix E shows graduate enrollments in arts and sciences from 1996 to 2001. As indicated, these enrollments are quite modest, with an overwhelming proportion (e.g., 86% in 2001) found in the teacher certification programs. For these programs there was a substantial enrollment increase in 2001 compared to the two previous years, while enrollment in the liberal arts graduate programs has stayed relatively stable over time.

Resources

Faculty. All full-time faculty are housed in an arts and sciences department, though interdisciplinary programs may hire adjunct faculty as needed. In Fall 2001, there was a total of 163 full-time faculty, with ten Distinguished
Professors, 57 Full Professors, 42 Associate Professors, 42 Assistant Professors, and twelve Lecturers. Of that total, 73% were tenured, 74% were female or ethnic minority, and 96% of all full-time faculty held either a doctorate or terminal degree for their field. Since 1996 there has been close to 30% turnover in full-time, tenure-track faculty in the School of Arts and Sciences. Forty-six new tenure-track faculty have been hired since 1996. In Fall 2001 there were 97 part-time faculty in the school teaching one to four courses per semester, or roughly three to twelve credits.

Fiscal. Resources available to the School of Arts and Sciences are generally sufficient to offer its major and minor programs and to provide the vast majority of general education courses for students. The budget for full-time and part-time faculty and staff is under the control of the President’s Cabinet, while the dean’s office has a supplies and equipment budget that funds faculty travel and other department needs. Each department also has a budget for supplies, equipment, photocopying, and other uses. In each of the last few years, additional money from the College has been made available to buy equipment, with these funds allocated to the dean, who solicits equipment requests from chairs and directors and then makes final allocation decisions.

Although the school does have sufficient resources in general to run its programs, some departments are in dire need of more funding, due in part to budget reductions in the mid-1990’s that prevented the replacement of faculty who retired or resigned. The College’s healthy enrollment the past few years has improved the budget significantly, making it possible to begin to make up these losses. More recent changes in the NYSED’s regulations for teacher education programs, however, have produced a large resource demand that affects the school because of its graduate and undergraduate programs in adolescence education. Reallocation of faculty positions from lower-enrollment programs has helped somewhat, but the effective delivery of adolescence education programs over time will require a significant influx of new resources.

Of course, uncertainty regarding resources inevitably has a negative impact on planning, although the school has had some success anticipating and pursuing new directions. For example, the Geography Department decided to shift heavily toward geographic information systems (GIS), and this decision has been a crucial consideration as new faculty are added to that program. Similarly, the Performing Arts Department determined several years ago to focus its efforts on musical theater, and the Philosophy Department redesigned its program to emphasize social philosophy. A common strategy in each of these cases was to concentrate on programmatic areas that best make use of faculty strengths, provide a quality education, and are likely to attract prospective students. This strategy in fact
embodies the school’s mission to offer an engaged liberal arts curriculum, and from this point on new program and faculty needs will be considered in light of that mission.

**Facilities and space.** The School of Arts and Sciences occupies all of Old Main, Bowers Hall, and the Dowd Fine Arts Center, and part of two other buildings on campus, Moffett Hall and Cornish Hall. Most classes are taught in these buildings, although several larger lecture courses are scheduled in Sperry, which contains large lecture halls. All departments have associated with them appropriate dedicated spaces, from art studios and an art gallery to theaters and practice rooms, specialized computer labs, and general and special labs for use in the natural sciences.

From an historical perspective, the physical heart of the arts and sciences at SUNY Cortland has been Old Main, and the relatively recent $10 million renovation and reoccupation of this building has created good classroom and computer laboratory space as well as department and faculty offices. A similar statement can be made with respect to the top floor of the Dowd Fine Arts building. According to several department reports, however, there remain a good many necessary construction and renovation projects. In particular, the Moffett building desperately needs renovation, as do many of the spaces, especially the laboratories, in the Bowers building, and the main theater in Dowd Fine Arts requires extensive work. In addition, renovation in Old Main was never completed, resulting in the windows not being replaced and making for a very uncomfortable working and teaching environment as well as extreme energy loss. Window replacement in Old Main is included as a high priority in the College’s next capital construction plan (2003-08), as described in Chapter 8.

**Academic Programs**

In the ten years prior to 1996 no new major programs were added in the School of Arts and Sciences. Since 1996, however, new undergraduate majors have been approved in human services, musical theater, and professional writing as well as a new master’s program in second language acquisition. Proposals will be submitted to SUNY System Administration in Spring 2002 for programs in new media: graphic design, water resources management, conservation biology, and new media: communications. Additional majors currently in the development stage are studio art, law and politics, and criminology.

As reflected in the discussion of enrollment, graduate programs are not a large part of the arts and sciences curriculum yet are nonetheless important to the school. All but two active graduate programs, master’s programs in English and history, are teacher preparation programs. The school would benefit from an increase in graduate students, an objective that should be enhanced by the creation of the new graduate studies director position.
Analysis

Congruence Between College Mission and School

The College’s Mission Statement describes the institution as “a comprehensive college of arts and sciences offering undergraduate and graduate programs in the liberal arts and a variety of professional fields,” making the School of Arts and Sciences an integral component of the College’s mission. The mission statement also asserts that “Our students gain skills, knowledge and conceptual understanding in their discipline,” and that “they grow intellectually and acquire fundamental life skills and values,” among which are “a desire to learn, an ability to think critically, an awareness of the excitement of discovery, an appreciation of diversity” among others. These outcomes are included in the goals and objectives of arts and sciences programs and, as described below, are included as measures in the assessment plans of many departments. Further, the General Education Program addresses all of the basic knowledge and skill areas described in the mission statement, including written communication skills, aesthetic sensibility, global awareness, appreciation for diversity, and environmental awareness.

Assessment Activities

As is true for all academic majors at the College, each major program in arts and sciences has an outcomes assessment program in place. These programs use a wide variety of assessment measures to evaluate their effectiveness, including pre- and post-tests, student writing portfolio review, standardized exams, exit interviews, and alumni surveys. Over the past three years, following the process described in Chapter 9, departments have implemented their assessment plans and have information bearing upon the extent to which their programs are achieving the goals they have established. In virtually all instances, departments have modified their practices based on assessment feedback, including changes in curriculum, pedagogy, and student advisement. As one example, the economics department determined that its business economics students did not satisfactorily retain their understanding of macroeconomics or political economy, leading faculty to consider adding a macroeconomic theory course at the intermediate level. This department also decided on the basis of program assessment that student writing was not up to desired standards, so faculty chose to treat virtually all upper-division courses as writing-intensive, an action that adds significantly more writing to these course requirements. Geology is another excellent example of a department that is being guided directly by information provided through learning outcomes assessment, making program revisions such as adding a statistics course requirement, increasing research requirements for majors, and implementing an oral presentation standard.
**Enrollment and Staffing**

As evident from the information presented above, the School of Arts and Sciences continues to struggle with under-enrollment in many of its major programs. Of course, decreased interest in the liberal arts as an academic major is a national phenomenon. Further, it may be more difficult to attract prospective liberal arts majors to SUNY Cortland because the College is so well known for its professional programs, both across the state and nationally. It is to the School of Arts and Sciences’ credit that it has undertaken numerous initiatives in recent years to reverse these trends, including the development of the Title III grant which the dean of arts and sciences co-authored. Other examples include the mission revision process described earlier, the resulting emphasis on engaged liberal arts, the new academic majors, and the newly developed First Programs. Another notable accomplishment is the development of the Arts and Sciences Alumni Advisory Council, formed by the dean several years ago and made up of prominent alumni from the school’s programs who meet on a regular basis and advise the dean on issues related to student recruitment. With all these activities underway, it is reasonable to believe that the College can reach its goal of achieving 40% of undergraduate enrollment in the arts and sciences, an objective included in both the Title III grant as well as in the Memorandum of Understanding with System Administration.

Closely related to the enrollment issue is that of faculty staffing. Despite the school’s declining enrollment, numerous programs remain to be delivered. Many departments are able to use their large-enrollment introductory classes, many of which meet general education requirements, to balance the smaller-enrollment, upper-division courses that majors must take to complete their curriculum requirements. Still, over time positions have been lost in some area as described above, meaning that some programs cannot achieve the depth they would like or offer the range of courses that would enrich their curriculum. One example is the political science department, which at this point has no faculty to teach courses in Asian politics or state politics.

Further, the need for new faculty has been greatly exacerbated by the new NYSED requirements, especially in teacher certification programs like the natural sciences and mathematics but also in departments that service these programs. It is impossible at this point for the Geography Department to meet the demands placed on it by new requirements in the elementary education program and the adolescence education-social studies program. Other departments feeling similar pressures are psychology, philosophy, art and art history, and performing arts. As one outcome of these staffing problems, the College must employ a significant number of adjunct faculty. While there is no reason to believe that this practice adversely affects quality of instruction, the large number of adjuncts does
contribute to instability within programs, increases the advisement and service responsibilities of full-timers, and makes it more difficult to maintain control over course content and program delivery.

**College Policies**

While college policies and procedures are generally adequate to allow the school to fulfill its mission, a fundamental problem results from SUNY Cortland’s highly centralized budget process. Through 2000-01 most major budget decisions required approval by the President’s Cabinet, meaning there was no meaningful fiscal control at the school level, or even the vice president’s level. The President’s Cabinet recent decision to implement a more decentralized budget process effective Fall 2001 is a good one, and should help alleviate these problems.

Other policies and procedures that limit the functioning and effectiveness of departments and the school overall include the curriculum review process, which is incredibly complex and cumbersome even before it reaches SUNY System Administration. To illustrate, a new curriculum program proposed by a department or center must be reviewed and approved by the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee, the dean, the College Curriculum Review Committee, and the provost, after which the process of procuring approval by System Administration begins. That process is initiated by a Letter of Intent sent by the president to System Administration and continues with all campuses in the system given the opportunity to respond to the letter. Then, the campus must prepare a program proposal following SUNY guidelines, submit the proposal to System Administration, and revise the proposal as requested before receiving SUNY approval, at which point the program must be submitted to and approved by the NYSED. Overall, this process is a lengthy one under the best of circumstances, and unreasonable delays sometimes occur, both on campus and at the system level.

Examples of other important policy-related issues include the recent decision by the College’s Graduate Faculty Executive Committee to disallow the cross-listing of undergraduate and graduate courses, a decision that will make it difficult for natural science departments to offer their graduate programs. Also, personnel procedures guiding the assessment and reappointment of junior faculty require revision, since in recent years the large group of new faculty at the College have consistently begun to submit far more materials than are necessary for a reasonable evaluation. Further, the College’s long range planning process, described in Chapter 9, does not explicitly involve academic departments except for faculty who volunteer to serve on priority goal action planning teams, and some provision for ensuring such involvement seems appropriate. Finally, at present there is no systematic process in place for designating funds annually for replacing computers or upgrading academic equipment, especially in labs. Given the
rapid turnover in technology as well as the expensive laboratory upgrades required to replace aging equipment, the absence of college-wide policies places a heavy burden on the dean’s fairly small supplies and equipment budgets.

Faculty Morale

The Middle States questionnaire to department chairpersons reveals a great deal regarding the current state of faculty morale in the School of Arts and Sciences. As is true in professional studies, the impact of new faculty has uplifted many departments, with chairpersons indicating these faculty invigorate programs, relate well to students, and bring new ideas and new approaches to teaching and their disciplines. Perhaps most noteworthy is the heavy representation of these individuals in the school’s new initiatives. For example, the new faculty make up a disproportionate number of participants in the Title III faculty development workshops, and they have also played a key role in the development of the Cortland First Programs.

Another highly positive development mentioned in department reports was the College’s acquisition of the Title III grant. In particular, the grant’s emphasis on the use of instructional technology in the classroom and the financial support it provided in enabling the College to acquire sophisticated equipment and software in this area seem likely to exert a favorable influence the school for years to come. Much of this influence will presumably be manifested in increased student enrollment due to the new academic majors being created out of Title III activities, three of which rely heavily on technology (i.e., new graphic design media, new communications media, geographic information systems). An additional Title III activity, which trains faculty in the use of course management software such as WebCT, will likely change the nature of courses across departments.

Chairpersons made other encouraging comments with respect to recent improvements in services from the Academic Support and Achievement Program, which provides study skills and other support to students, and to the Student Affairs Division of the College. They also commented enthusiastically on events such as Scholars’ Day, noting in particular the full and lively schedule of speakers and presentations. Less positively, they pointed to the light attendance that is characteristic of Scholars’ Day, saying that students are unlikely to attend such events unless required to by their professors.

Along these lines, an evaluation of department chairpersons’ comments revealed dissatisfaction with the College’s intellectual climate, a point also made in Chapter 11. To some extent, chairpersons attribute this problem to their students, perceiving them as possessing a lower level of academic abilities relative to faculty expectations and as too vocationally-oriented. They also expressed concern with the College’s reputation as a party school,
although several studies including the one conducted by George Dehne and Associates in 1997 have failed to confirm this impression. Still, in Fall 2001 the provost created and charged a committee with exploring the College’s intellectual climate and conducting ongoing discussions across the campus regarding this matter.

Other factors contributing to low morale included the persistently low enrollments in many of the school’s programs, low faculty salaries, salary compression, and perceptions that the College’s administration places greater emphasis on bureaucratic than academic activities. Finally, chairpersons mentioned a number of external factors that were exerting a negative influence on departments and faculty. First and foremost was outside intrusion into curriculum programs, especially by the SUNY Board of Trustees and the NYSED, and the accompanying perception that faculty were losing control with respect to curriculum and academic freedom. Other negative influences from outside the College included inadequate funding from System Administration and excessive vocationalism on the part of students’ parents as well as in the culture overall.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES AND SUPPORT AND SERVICE UNITS

Office of Information Resources and the Center for the Advancement of Technology in Education

Information resources. Information Resources (IR) -- consisting of academic computing services, administrative computing services, classroom media services, and Memorial Library -- is responsible for planning, developing, coordinating, and managing the information and technological resources and services of the campus. IR advocates the utilization of information and technology to enhance the teaching and learning experience for SUNY Cortland faculty and students in a way that supports the College’s Mission Statement, facilitates distance learning initiatives, and offers a full complement of services to provide for curriculum and administrative needs. A full description of IR, its structure, individual unit functions, and achievements since its creation only eight years ago is found in Chapter 12, but it is appropriate here to acknowledge its impact on the campus as an integral part of academic affairs, with special emphasis placed on information not stressed in Chapter 12.

IR currently consists of two management/confidential employees, 13 library faculty, 28.85 professionals, and 22 clerical staff, for a total of 65.85 FTE staff members, representing an 11.1 FTE increase (20%) since 1995-96. Approximately 160 student staff members, each working 8-15 hours per week, supplement the permanent staff. IR staff are distributed across units as 32.25 FTE staff in Memorial Library, six in classroom media services, 12.5 in academic computing services, 13.1 in administrative computing services, and two in the IR office. The total budget allocation for IR is $4.7 million, representing a 52% increase since 1996-97, with most of this increase used to
support new technology initiatives such as BANNER 2000, the Technology Help Center, the faculty/staff training program, distance education, technology classrooms, and networked facilities. A mandatory student technology fee instituted in 1995 provides partial support for computer labs, technology classrooms, the data communications network, and BANNER 2000. For 2001-02 this fee totals $150.

Also included under IR are the more academically traditional programs and services provided by Memorial Library, although these have shifted significantly the last few years to reflect the growing influence of technology and emphasis on information literacy. In fact, Memorial Library has developed a strong program of information and computer literacy including student technology workshops, subject-related instruction, a Composition Library Instruction Program (CLIP), and faculty/staff training workshops. Further, many of the advanced Computer Application Program (CAP) courses are offered through the library, and are designed to meet the higher-level computer skill needs of advanced courses in disciplines that rely on technology.

A 1997 Memorial Library survey indicated students’ high level of satisfaction with library services, although information collected through the library’s suggestion box consistently shows dissatisfaction with heating, air conditioning, and library hours. On the 2000 SUNY Student Opinion Survey, library services were rated at 3.63 (out of 5), and library facilities were rated 3.69, ranking the College 9th and 8th among the 13 SUNY university colleges, respectively. Memorial Library regularly makes changes in its operations based on user feedback, such as extending hours and the types of training programs to offer to students, faculty, and staff.

The library evaluates and builds its collection based on a variety of criteria. Librarians serve as liaisons to academic departments where information about programs, courses, and assignments is gathered. These materials are supplemented by information gathered at the reference desk, by collection use statistics, and by interlibrary borrowing patterns. Unfortunately, the library acquisitions budget has not come close to keeping pace with inflation, and the cost of electronic materials has risen dramatically. Compared to 1995-96, expenditures for electronic materials increased in 1999-00 from $7,200 to $60,024, and since the acquisitions budget has not grown, it has been necessary to cut the print collections severely.

Overall, IR’s greatest strength is maintaining a dedicated and skilled staff with a strong service orientation who have made it possible for IR to play a vital role in the College’s impressive growth in technology the last five years. There are, however, areas that need strengthening if IR is to continue to provide effective programs and services. Particular problems include inadequate staffing levels for back-up and cross-training, difficulty maintaining
necessary support to the expanding network and proliferation of computer labs and technology classrooms, and recruiting and retaining qualified CAP instructors. Further, although the student technology fee provides much-needed extra funding, costs in the area of technology are prohibitive, and the unit’s current operational budget is not adequate to both purchase new equipment and replace and upgrade existing equipment. A key need area at the present time is a new telephone switch, since there is no remaining capacity on the present switch.

Center for the Advancement of Technology in Education. The Center for Advancement of Technology in Education (CATE), described more fully in Chapter 12, is an interdisciplinary center that works closely with the IR staff in promoting and supporting technology. The current CATE director is a library faculty member, and the CATE Council is made up mostly of IR staff and teaching faculty. Chief among CATE’s responsibilities is oversight of the College’s Computer Applications Program, but this group also provides important services through its three subcommittees (hardware/software, future directions, and curriculum). During 2000-01, CATE analyzed course content in all computer courses to determine how well they addressed new NYSED regulations.

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

In 1998 the College made a significant commitment to and investment in assessment activity when it created the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) out of the former Office of Institutional Research/Registrar unit, having clear expectations that OIRA would offer substantial and visible support for assessment initiatives in both academic and support and service units. Other overlapping functions include providing institutional data to internal and external constituents and providing administrative and research support. The office is administered by a full-time director, professional assistant, and clerical assistant. A more complete description of OIRA, its history, functions, and impact on the campus is found in Chapter 9.

As detailed in other sections of this report, the OIRA has had significant impact on the campus in a short period of time, and it is unlikely that the progress made in the area of assessment the past few years would have taken place without this unit and its director’s leadership. In addition, the OIRA has documented its effectiveness in its own assessment report, fulfilling objectives such as functioning as an institutional data clearinghouse, providing research and administrative support in assisting assessment of the College’s General Education Program, helping establish open communication and understanding across campus about assessment, and coordinating all SUNY assessment initiatives. The OIRA has identified progress in technology and its use as a major strength, perhaps best exemplified in the acquisition and implementation of the TracDat assessment software across campus.
Office of Sponsored Programs

The Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) is designated as the office responsible for processing requests for all externally funded activities and for coordinating the administrative process to the point of acceptance and allocation of funds. The office offers assistance to faculty and staff in all aspects of proposal preparation and submission, and is staffed with three full-time personnel including a director, a senior grants administrator, and a secretary. This office’s operating budget is supported by indirect cost revenues generated by grants and partial support from state accounts for normal office needs.

As described earlier, beginning in 1999 the College eliminated a number of special events from this office’s responsibilities and since that time a full-time grants administrator was added to the staff as well as additional resources, partly in response to SUNY’s new resource allocation model that rewards campuses by supplementing their budgets with 20% of total external funding generated each year. Much of this office’s activity, especially as it serves to promote faculty and staff development, is described in Chapter 5.

The College’s recent investments in OSP have already begun to pay dividends, with total sponsored funding increasing from $914,000 in 1998-99 to $1.89 million in 1999-00, and this figure increasing to $2.1 million in 2000-01. Further, OSP has established an ambitious agenda for itself as part of the College’s Memorandum of Understanding with SUNY System Administration, committing to increasing total sponsored funding to $4 million by 2005. SUNY Cortland was ranked tenth out of the 13 SUNY university colleges in total sponsored funding for 2000-01, representing an improvement from twelfth two years before. In order to meet its funding targets, OSP has adopted a number of strategies intended to increase number of proposals submitted as well as total funding received. One approach is to use senior faculty as mentors in helping junior faculty develop proposals. Also, since many faculty are first-time proposal writers, OSP is concentrating on this group, and has committed itself to providing the support and assistance these faculty need to succeed. As another strategy, OSP has developed a strategic plan matching specific faculty by discipline with appropriate sponsors, factoring in federal and state initiatives. In addition, effective Fall 2001 President Taylor included grant activity as a special criterion to be considered in the awarding of discretionary salary increases.

Another factor that should enhance sponsored programs activity is increased expectations by the College that faculty members engage in scholarship. Junior faculty are now being strongly encouraged to develop a research program in their field as a standard for continued employment. Obviously, the influx of new faculty in recent years
helps in this area, since these individuals are for the most part beginning their academic and research careers. The College should continue to emphasize and support scholarly and creative activity in this group especially, and seek to hire key faculty with research backgrounds sufficient to attract big awards. In addition, SUNY Cortland should continue to pursue grant funding in its areas of strength, such as science education, mathematics education, special education, and urban education.

**Graduate Studies and Outreach**

The Office of Graduate Studies and Outreach (GSO) is the newest administrative unit on campus, created effective 2000-01 with a new director hired in April 2001. Formerly, the two schools had responsibility for their own graduate students, with most advisement and curricular matters handled in individual departments in which students were enrolled and various services scattered across the campus. In light of the substantial increase in graduate student enrollment and the likelihood this trend would continue due to changes in state certification requirements, the College acted to consolidate resources, programs, and services for graduate programs by forming GSO. Outreach components were also consolidated, and include the Center for Educational Exchange, the Access to College Education Program, and the Liberty Partnership Project. Graduate studies is staffed with a full-time director, a part-time assistant director and two full-time secretaries, and outreach functions are staffed by one full-time coordinator, a half-time professional, and a full-time secretary. The GSO director also supervises the College’s Mohawk Valley Graduate Center located in Rome, New York, which is staffed by one .75 FTE clerical staff person.

The GSO director works closely with the academic deans in coordinating programs and services for graduate students to ensure the timely and appropriate delivery of academic programs. Graduate admissions remains assigned to the College’s Admissions Office, with individual departments responsible for working with this office to establish criteria for admission and accept students. Eventually, it is intended that GSO will take over the function of overseeing graduate admissions.

Overall, SUNY Cortland is authorized to confer five master’s degrees (M.A., M.S., M.A.T., M.S.T., M.S.E.) and the certificate of advanced study (CAS). At present, the College offers 34 master’s programs (all but three of which lead to teacher certification) and three CAS programs. In addition, six new master’s programs are currently under development or progressing through the campus’ internal approval process, three existing programs are attempting to serve as collaborative programs with those at other SUNY campuses, and new standards imposed by NYSED will necessitate the revision of the two education administration CAS programs in the near future.
Based on enrollment trends the last three years, the College’s decision to consolidate resources and services into the GSO appears more than justified. Specifically, graduate enrollment increased 18% from Fall 1999 to Fall 2000, and 21% from Fall 2000 to Fall 2001, when an all-time high of 1,855 graduate students registered for courses. Growth has been especially strong in the education, educational administration, and recreation and leisure studies programs, all housed in the School of Professional Studies. Further, according to the GSO director, Fall 2001 graduate enrollments could have easily been much higher, but faculty and space shortages led to an unprecedented closing of the graduate application process in certain programs. In addition, non-matriculated students were restricted to one day of walk-in registration in order to give degree program students priority in registering for classes, a strategy that was repeated for Spring 2002 registration.

Clearly, the major enrollment management task for the College at present with respect to graduate admissions is to gain control of this process, determining the number and program mix of students it can effectively serve. In fact, over the past six months ongoing discussions have focused on identifying programs that will have enrollment limits and developing criteria to be used in establishing these limits, leading undoubtedly to more selective and competitive admissions criteria for some programs. At the same time, strategies are being developed for intensifying recruitment efforts for programs that are not over-enrolled.

The Mohawk Valley Graduate Center (MVGC), a satellite site located approximately 70 miles from Cortland, occupies leased classroom and office space on the Mohawk Valley Community College campus. Operational for more than a decade, the MVGC has provided graduate education to the professional education community in the Rome and Utica areas as well as to the rural areas north and east of these cities. Although complete graduate programs are not offered at MVGC, core courses in selected master’s programs – notably education and health and the educational administration CAS program – are offered on a regular basis. Students must attend the main SUNY Cortland campus for specialized courses within the programs, which takes place primarily during the summer months. Although faculty from Cortland’s main campus travel to MVGC to provide instruction, there is also great reliance on adjunct faculty. On an annual basis, around 300-500 graduate students enroll in courses at MVGC.

GSO also coordinates outreach operations that extend beyond the SUNY Cortland campus to area schools, businesses, and the community. The Center for Educational Exchange (CEE) functions to create productive partnerships between the College and local schools and to facilitate professional exchanges among educators at all levels. Ongoing programs for educators include contract course partnerships for teachers, special topic graduate
courses, in-service training for teachers, programs for area school administrators, and courses and workshops as mandated by the NYSED. The Access to College Education (ACE) Program is a joint effort of SUNY Cortland, Ithaca College, Cornell University, and Tompkins Cortland Community College, working with 14 area school districts and several regional BOCES, to encourage high school students to complete high school with the skills needed to access and succeed in college. This program, which is housed at SUNY Cortland, targets students with personal, family and financial concerns that prevent them from considering a college education. Activities include holding career and skills workshops, hosting sessions for parents and students that focus on the college admissions process and how to prepare for the SAT, pairing the students with college student mentors, and providing assistance in the college admissions process, including the procurement of financial aid.

The Liberty Partnership Program (LPP) also serves youth at risk, helping them complete high school and seek further education or meaningful employment afterwards. SUNY Cortland’s LPP is the largest in the state, comprised of fifteen school districts, three colleges, a university, numerous community-based organizations, and private industry. Funded to serve a minimum of 340 students, LPP provided services to 400 students and their families across 15 school districts in eight counties in 2001. Sample activities include bringing students to campus for Science and Technology Day and holding Community Service Day, which benefits individuals in numerous placements like Head Start and nursing homes.

**Center for Environmental and Outdoor Education**

With the retirement of the director of SUNY Cortland’s Outdoor Education Center in Raquette Lake in July 2000, the College saw the opportunity to create an organizational structure that would provide better oversight for and coordination of its three outdoor education facilities, Camp Huntington, the Brauer Memorial Geologic Field Station near Albany, and Hoxie Gorge, approximately ten miles from Cortland (see Figure 1). A task force was formed to make recommendations regarding restructuring programs and services related to outdoor education, with an explicit charge to further integrate the outdoor education centers into the academic life of the campus. This group ultimately recommended that a full-time director of environmental and outdoor education be hired who would report directly to the provost. While the former director had been stationed full-time in Raquette Lake, this group also recommended that the new director be stationed on the SUNY Cortland campus around 50% of the time and located at Raquette Lake only during that facility’s busy season (e.g., from mid-spring through late fall). Additional staffing
for the center includes a full-time assistant director and full-time secretary, and one full-time and one half-time professional are located at the Raquette Lake facility for maintenance and technical support.

When the new director was hired in Fall 2000, he was charged to develop a clear set of measurable goals related to the usage of the three sites, the maintenance of the facilities, and the identification and pursuit of additional resources. Of particular concern is the fact that these facilities cost the College around $500,000 per year, which comes directly from its base budget. Further, $1 million of the College’s current capital construction budget was devoted to building a new sewage treatment plant.

While there are nominal user charges for the Raquette Lake facility, revenues generated by these charges are divided between the College and Auxiliary Services Corporation (ASC), since ASC provides food service. A key concern is the cost of maintaining the outdoor education facilities, with the Raquette Lake facility consisting of more than thirty individual structures and the Brauer Field Station including an administration building with dining and classroom facilities and an outbuilding for dormitory accommodations. The Hoxie Gorge facility does not have any buildings located on it. Given Camp Huntington’s status as one of the original great camps of the Adirondacks, there is a special urgency to finding funding to ensure the structural integrity of this site. The College has made numerous attempts to solicit external funding for this purpose, and needs to continue these efforts by expanding the current endowment to making certain structures are maintained appropriately and renovated as necessary.

**Office of International Programs**

SUNY Cortland has a rich tradition of international education and maintains the oldest and largest study abroad program for students in the SUNY system. Overall, the Office of International Programs (OIP) has two primary functions: To send SUNY students from Cortland and other campuses abroad and to bring exchange students from partner institutions abroad to SUNY Cortland. To a lesser extent this office facilitates cooperative endeavors, short-term visits, and exchanges for faculty and staff. OIP includes a full-time director and assistant director, a full-time secretary, and a half-time secretary. Salaries for the director and assistant director are paid through state appropriations while other salaries, equipment and supply purchases, travel and some office support services are funded through tuition and program fees collected from students who participate in an international program experience. Its participation in two programs, at the University of North London and the University of Salamanca, has been formally evaluated by Middle States, and these reviews were overwhelmingly positive.
OIP carefully monitors enrollments within each of its off-campus sites, and between 1995 and 2000 overall enrollments increased slightly, from 197 to 254. In general, around 55% of the students who use the OIP to participate in an international experience are SUNY Cortland students, with 45% coming from other SUNY schools. Of concern is the fact that enrollment in its largest programs (e.g., London and Salamanca) has weakened over time due to higher costs and more competition from other campuses, and OIP has eliminated programs because of low enrollments, such as those in Caracas, Neuchatel, and the Academy of Versailles. Other programs have been added, at sites such as Griffith University in Brisbane, the University of the Sunshine Coast, the University of La Rochelle, and the VEN-USA Institute for International Studies and Modern Languages located in Merida, Venezuela.

Honors Program

The College’s Honors Program is open to a select group of entering fall freshmen and rising sophomores, and offers academically gifted students special advisement and seminars. To complete the program, students must take at least 24 credit hours in courses with an “honors” designation, with these courses representing a range of departments and programs and some of which meet the College’s general education requirements. Students must also complete an honors thesis and complete 40 hours of community service. Until 1998-99 the Honors Program was capped at 20 students per incoming class, at which point this number was doubled to 40. The Honors Program is administered by a full-time faculty member in exchange for one course release time per semester or stipend. Other funding for the program includes around $14,000 annually to hire adjunct replacements for full-time faculty who teach in the program, and a student assistant is hired to provide support around 15 hours per week. Overall, the coordinator reports that the existing level of resources is adequate to support the program.

In recent years, the Honors Program has expanded course offerings, recruited additional faculty to teach in the program, and raised admissions standards. It has also attracted a more ethnically diverse entering class, with four out of 31 students in 2000-01 belonging to ethnic minority groups, although a very high proportion of students are female (86%). Plans for the future include increasing the program’s visibility on campus, further expanding course offerings, increasing intellectual rigor, and creating more cohesiveness among students enrolled in the program.

Recommendations

1. Continue to support the goal of increasing the percentage of full-time faculty, through resource reallocation if necessary, using current and reliable data to create an equitable workload situation across the College.

2. Provide necessary support to the provost’s office so that the provost can lead academic affairs in developing and guiding a strategic agenda.
3. Conduct a needs analysis of units in Academic Affairs with respect to office budget, staffing, travel support, professional development, and technology needs, and make adjustments where necessary.

4. Continue the process of decentralizing the budget, empowering the provost and deans in particular to have increased budget and position control and holding them accountable.

5. The provost should establish a task force to address the issue of possible restructuring within the College or at least within Professional Studies to better manage program enrollments as well as faculty, administrative, and advisement workloads.

6. The Professional Studies Chairs’ Council should work closely with Enrollment Management to more effectively administer program enrollment consistent with standards and quality expectations.

7. Smaller-enrollment departments should work with Admissions to provide supplemental strategies for recruiting undergraduates to their programs.

8. All departments should report on the quality of their advisement practices in their annual report and program review reports. Additionally, continued efforts should be made to reduce advisement loads (including both undergraduate and graduate advisees).

9. Develop a structure for coordinating internships across the College, perhaps by creating an encompassing office that oversees efforts presently carried out by the Internship Office, Field Studies, and individual departments.

10. The Facilities and Master Plan Oversight Committee should include a member of the Professional Studies Chairs’ Council and of the Arts and Sciences’ Chairs’ Council so that the schools can monitor the progress being made with respect to the Cornish/Van Hoesen and Moffett rehabilitation projects.

11. The Facilities and Master Plan Oversight Committee must give highest priority to planning for additional space to meet Professional Studies’ needs given enrollment increases and plans to add new faculty lines.

12. Revise the College’s long range planning process so as to ensure input and participation by departments and centers.

13. Develop a plan to renovate and upgrade the laboratories in the natural science departments and the main theater in Dowd Fine Arts.

14. Develop a plan to support faculty scholarly travel needs at a higher rate, with a goal of $1,000 annually for untenured full-time faculty and $750 for tenured faculty.

15. Seek ways to increase funding for technology and communication needs by allocating more state funds for technology, raising the technology fee to support growing student initiatives, and securing more grants and corporation contracts.

16. Continue to provide leadership with respect to the College’s long range planning goal of infusing technology across the College for both instructional and non-instructional functions.

17. Develop a permanent growth budget for library materials, including both print materials and emerging technologies.

18. Develop a plan for upgrading the network and telephone switch.

19. Continue to assess the technology, computer and library needs of the campus in order to maximize services by integrating the results into all planning efforts.
20. Hire key faculty with strong research backgrounds who can successfully attract significant external funding, with initial priority placed on funding to support the College’s urban education initiative.

21. Maintain an institutional commitment to supporting and assisting first-time proposal writers.

22. Transfer oversight for graduate admissions to the Graduate Studies and Outreach Office.

23. Develop comprehensive enrollment management plan for College’s graduate programs.

24. Increase proportion of full-time faculty who offer instruction at the Mohawk Valley Graduate Center.

25. Stabilize and restore each of the original structures constructed by W.W. Durant located on Pine Knot in Raquette Lake at the Outdoor Education Center, expanding the endowment and identifying benefactors to assure the continued operation of the Center.
ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

CHAPTER 4

Description

Introduction

The enrollment management unit was created in September 1995 when the offices of admissions, registrar, institutional research and records, financial aid, and advisement and first-year programming were brought together under an associate vice president who reports to the provost. In February 1999, the position of institutional research director was reconfigured as a director of institutional research and assessment position and was moved to report directly to the provost. In Fall 2000, the Office of Continuing Education/Summer and Winter Sessions was moved to report to the associate vice president for enrollment management.

The enrollment management unit was charged in 1996 with not only recapturing enrollment losses experienced during the previous five years, but also diversifying the student body with ethnic minority students, international students, non-traditional students, honor students, students majoring in arts and sciences, and students from under-represented regions of New York State.

Programs, Functions, and Services

Mission and operations. Enrollment management’s mission is to coordinate student recruitment and retention efforts for the College. To exert more influence over enrollment, a systematic set of activities is used. These activities include providing consistent and clear articulation of the institution’s mission, credible recruitment materials, comprehensive financial and financial aid planning, informed responses to student interests and needs, staff development and training, and a multitude of retention activities. Department heads attempt to coordinate staffing and provide a flow of information and integration of decisions so that each student is given high quality attention. The goal is to use a strategic process that involves comprehensive planning to achieve and maintain the optimum recruitment, retention, and graduation of students as defined within the academic context of the institution.

The departments within enrollment management attempt to collaborate with virtually every other department on campus, reflecting in part the fact that recruiting and retaining students have increasingly become highly sophisticated processes. Today, student recruitment and admissions work are aggressive, on-going activities, reaching far beyond merely informing prospective students and their parents about the College’s offerings. Primary changes in functioning have shifted from travel recruitment and advertising to on-campus programming that
provides extensive involvement with SUNY Cortland students, faculty, and staff. Similarly, financial aid is no longer a charitable student service for a small portion of the student body but a complex business enterprise, heavily dependent on resources from federal and state governments. With respect to advisement, students today expect much more from their academic advisor than simply assistance with course selection, often requesting career counseling information and sometimes even help with academic, social, and personal difficulties. In addition to being responsible for overseeing all academic records and their accuracy, security, and maintenance, the Registrar’s Office has been at the forefront of the College’s conversion two years ago to a new student information system, BANNER 2000, and has played a key role in helping other offices across campus adapt to this new system.

**Assessment.** Assessing the effectiveness of its programs and services has become part of the culture of enrollment management, which like other support and service units has taken part in the College’s assessment planning process. Each department is responsible for strategic plans and assessment of its objectives as described in its 2000-01 assessment plan. Every department has used student survey data to determine strengths and weaknesses in providing services, formal assessments of all workshops and visitation days are used to reshape additional activities, and all departments have used data from the Student Opinion Survey (SOS) to shape goals for changes in operations. In addition, the Noel-Levitz College Student Inventory is administered each year in COR 101, the College’s first-year experience course, with individual student data and composite data shared with instructors.

Members of the unit assess so often and so naturally that assessment has become part of everything that is done. Discussions, both formal and informal, frequently take place in which one office asks another why it is or is not engaging in a particular practice. Problems are often analyzed spontaneously, and consideration given to improving systems that are not necessarily malfunctioning. Most important is the fact that these discussions and assessments take place not only within each department but also at the bi-weekly enrollment management meetings, when personnel from each office can discuss the impact of changes in their department on other offices in the unit.

**Resources.**

The admissions staff consists of six classified and nine professional staff employees, with 20-25 part-time student employees assisting with operations annually. Two new staffing lines were added to the office in 1996 and dramatic increases in scholarship support have been infused, enabling admissions to meet or exceed its annual enrollment target. The budget for the Admissions Office is supplemented with a graduate student fee IFR account.
In Fall 2000 the Admissions Office was moved to the renovated first floor of the Miller Building where it enjoys a greatly improved aesthetic appeal.

The advisement staff consists of a coordinator, assistant coordinator, three part-time professional advisors, and one full-time secretary. An additional full-time advisor was hired in Spring 2001 in support of the Title III advising initiatives, and supplemental staff including a professional, graduate assistant, and student assistants is hired for summer orientation. The Advisement Office budget is augmented through the orientation IFR account, and the office was moved to its current location in Brockway Hall in the Fall 2000 semester. These physical facilities are outstanding and include space to provide each advisor with an office. Also at the time of the move, new computers and appropriate furnishings to meet the increase in staff and services were provided.

The staff in the Financial Aid Office includes a director, assistant director, and three professional advisors as well as four clerical staff. While the personnel on the financial aid staff are well qualified, experienced, and committed to excellence, the addition of over 1,000 students and three major programs -- TAP, scholarships, and Veterans Affairs -- to their responsibilities has severely taxed their abilities and resources. Excessive overtime has become standard operating procedure for the professional staff. The Financial Aid Office recently moved from the third floor to the second floor in the Miller Building. The new location provides adequate private office space for each advisor so that conversations can remain confidential. The department also received significant new physical resources in the past few years, including new office computers and furniture.

Staff in the Registrar’s Office consists of the registrar, two additional professionals, and seven clerical staff members. The two professionals include an assistant registrar position that was added to the office in 1998. The successful completion of extensive renovations to the office, partly in response to the 1992 Middle States external review, dramatically changed the environment for visitors coming to the office and provided all workers with their own workspace. Additionally, the office was allocated necessary space for hard copy files. A satellite location in the Moffett Building is used for all registration, drop and add transactions, and new student orientation and registration activities, with temporary service personnel hired and trained to execute these activities at the satellite location. All of these operations are dependent upon support from administrative computing. The Registrar’s Office budget is minimally sufficient to support office operations, as costs associated with producing forms and printing escalate on an ongoing basis. The office budget is supplemented through a transcript fee IFR account.
The Continuing Education Office, which also encompasses Summer and Winter Session functions, is staffed by one professional and 2.5 clerical support positions. Since the continuing education program is expected to generate sufficient income for its operation from fees paid for its non-credit course offerings, its daily operations budget is minimal. The summer and winter session funds generated are sufficient to support the staff and marketing necessary for the programs, and also support the salaries of other campus staff. During the Fall 2000 semester continuing education was restructured to decrease the number of non-credit course offerings and to provide more support for adult learners. The operation was moved to Brockway Hall so that staff now enjoy very comfortable office space that includes a waiting area for adult learners. The move also placed this office in close proximity to the Advisement Center, allowing these units to share programs and support each other’s operations.

Analysis

Congruence Between College Mission and Program Goals

The goals of enrollment management derive from the College’s Mission Statement and long range planning goals. Specific examples of long range planning goals in the last two years relevant to departments within enrollment management include increasing enrollment of students from contiguous area high schools, developing a plan for building, qualifying, grading, and tracking prospect inquiries, improving transfer credit evaluations for new transfer students, attracting more high academic students through increased merit scholarships, increasing graduate student enrollment, improving financial aid customer service, providing a program to attract and retain both undergraduate and graduate adult learners, and increasing the proportion of ethnic minority students.

Assessment of Programs, Functions, and Services

In 1996 a comprehensive analysis by USA Group Noel-Levitz indicated that the decline experienced by the College in new student enrollment stemmed in part from an alternating drop in both new freshmen and new transfer applications, with a 14% decrease witnessed overall from 1994 to 1996. The Admissions Office subsequently set as its goal to increase the number of applications to the College. Also, based on surveys and other feedback suggesting that SUNY Cortland was perceived as an attractive and friendly campus, admissions efforts focused on bringing more prospective students and families to the College for visitations.

Overall, these strategies have been quite effective, with total number of new student applications increasing from 8,828 in 1996 to well over 10,361 for the incoming Fall 2001 cohort. During the same time period, the College began to focus on lowering its acceptance rate and increasing its yield rate for students, which was made possible in
part because of the significantly increased application pool. Table 3 shows these various statistics for new first-year students from 1997 to 2001.

Table 3

Applications, Acceptance and Yield Rates for First-Year Students, 1997-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 1997</th>
<th>Fall 1998</th>
<th>Fall 1999</th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>6,481</td>
<td>6,893</td>
<td>7,359</td>
<td>7,903</td>
<td>8,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield Rate</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall impact on the College’s enrollment of enrollment’s management recruitment and retention strategies has been just as positive, with total enrollment growing from 6,278 students in 1996 at its lowest point to 7,742 students in 2001, the highest in SUNY Cortland’s history. Enrollment changes from 1991-2001, in terms of total headcount and AAFTE, are depicted below in Figure 4.

Figure 4

Total Headcount and AAFTE Enrollment, 1991-2001

Other indices of enrollment management’s effectiveness include student retention rates, with first-year retention rates improving from 72% for the 1996 cohort to 76% for the 1999 class. In addition, the percentage of freshman students who left the College prior to completing their first semester dropped from 5.7% for the 1996 class to 1.5% for the 2000 class. At the same time, the percentage of academic dismissals for these same groups has decreased from 9.2% to 5.98%, respectively. While these positive changes are likely the result of numerous strategies and
initiatives implemented the last five years, appropriate credit must be given to the contributions of the College’s first-year experience course, COR 101, offered for the first time in 1997.

Other internally collected data, including the COR 101 student assessment and transfer student need survey, show that students are satisfied with specific services. Information gathered from students who completed a registration survey in Spring 2000 clearly indicated that they were satisfied with both staff and services during the registration process. The COR 101 course is being revised again, and training of COR 101 instructors being redesigned to increase faculty and staff satisfaction with that course. In addition, transfer orientation structure was redesigned after meeting with student focus groups and inviting student feedback.

A specific assessment success story in the Financial Aid Office involved the switch to Federal Family Education Loan Program (FFELP) from direct loans. After extensive analysis, the office staff recommended that the College switch to working with the banks rather than getting loan money directly from the federal government. That decision has brought significant improvements to the administration of the loan programs, as well as better service to students and the College.

On a less positive note, SUNY’s 2000 Student Opinion Survey (SOS) showed that SUNY Cortland students are less satisfied than students at the other twelve university colleges with the availability of the courses they want, registration procedures in general, campus-wide academic advisement services, and the value of information provided by their academic advisor. It is hoped that advising initiatives funded by the Title III grant will begin to address these issues. Evaluations from a recent Advising Seminar, held as a part of Title III and coordinated through the Advisement Center, were consistently high in all areas including usefulness of the seminar, quality of information provided, and overall satisfaction with the program.

Strengths, Weaknesses, and Problems

A major strength of the enrollment management unit results from the College’s overall commitment to its operations and demonstrated willingness to invest significant resources into the recruitment and retention of students. Examples include the addition of staff in all units, facilities renovations, hardware and software purchases, support for developing and offering COR 101, and increased operating budgets. In addition, the importance of the Cortland College Foundation’s aggressive fund-raising efforts in support of scholarships, more fully described in Chapter 7, as well as the College’s concentrated marketing efforts cannot be overstated. Further, the Title III grant has infused significant funding into the College’s advisement program in support of activities like advisor training,
the development of advising materials, and strengthening connections between advisors and other resources on campus.

Partly as a result of this influx of resources, enrollment management has been able to attract highly competent and dedicated persons to head each of its units as well as very qualified professional and clerical staff. Together, these individuals work collaboratively and effectively both within and across departments to ensure maximum coordination of recruitment and retention strategies. As a related point, enrollment management benefits greatly from its systematic planning process that is so closely aligned with institutional goals and objectives. As just one example, in 1996 the Admissions Office focused necessarily on simply increasing overall enrollment, distinguishing only among freshmen, transfers and graduate students. As enrollment has grown, admissions objectives have become much more focused on specific student groups through the long range planning process, including ethnic minority students and adult learners.

There are also conditions that weaken enrollment management’s effectiveness, including an inability to establish productive relationships with all units across the College that play a role in attracting and keeping students. It has been especially difficult to collaborate as full partners with academic departments, some of which have not accepted ownership of student recruitment responsibilities. A similar statement characterizes academic programs’ role in advising initiatives, as not all departments have been willing to participate in activities sure to enhance the advisement and registration processes. As one example, although most departments have cooperated in building the computerized degree audit made possible through BANNER 2000, some have expressed resistance, an indication that at least some faculty do not feel fully invested in important enrollment management initiatives. A related concern is that, as it becomes possible for students to register via the web through BANNER 2000, the College needs to think carefully about the role of faculty advisors in the advisement process.

Another area of weakness is response time within some department units, an issue that draws the most frequent complaints and represents the greatest source of customer dissatisfaction. In part this problem reflects the fact that the level of expectations among students and parents has increased substantially in recent years. Parents in particular seem to expect that departments must respond immediately when they call and leave a message, mail or fax in documents, or send an e-mail message. While enrollment management’s objective has been to respond to any inquiry within 48 hours, this response rate does not satisfy many customers.
Related to the response time issue is enrollment management’s greatest problem at the present time, the significantly increased workload in all department offices. Offices’ ability to respond to all inquiries even within 48 hours is requiring an average work week of around fifty hours for professional staff. Of particular concern are the caseloads in the Financial Aid Office. According to the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, based on the College’s current enrollment the Financial Aid should have twelve full-time staff; instead it has only ten.

Ongoing and future challenges stem from academic program changes resulting from new requirements by SUNY System Administration, NYSED, and NCATE requirements, described fully in Chapter 14. All these changes have significant implications for the Registrar’s Office, which must keep careful track of program requirements and make changes in BANNER 2000 accordingly. Admissions and the Advisement Office are affected as well, since they must provide clear and accurate information to students and parents so as to enhance academic planning. Other factors likely to provide challenges include increased competition for students, tuition discounting and scholarships at other institutions, and the development of new majors at competing institutions. In addition, multiple governmental and private agencies, including the U.S. Department of Education, NYSED and student loan lenders, will continue to influence the College’s ability to deliver financial aid, making it necessary to maintain professional relationships with these agencies. Finally, the often-late New York State budget makes it extremely difficult for the Financial Aid Office to provide students with accurate financial information necessary to make a decision about attending the institution.

Relationship to Self-Study Emphasis Areas

In many ways enrollment management has been at the leading edge across the College in technological applications, including the Registrar Office’s accomplishment of storing archived academic records on a CD–Optical Disk System. As indicated earlier the Registrar’s Office has also contributed significantly to SUNY Cortland’s conversion to and implementation of BANNER 2000. When the College upgraded to this new student information system, it did so with the perspective that this change should bring qualitative improvements to the functions and services performed, not just substitute automation for slower, more manual processes. Conversion to BANNER 2000 was an incredibly costly endeavor, not just in financial terms but also with respect to human effort, with individuals spending untold numbers of hours making sure this process took place as smoothly as possible and with minimum disruption or inconvenience to students. As a result, faculty, staff, and students have much greater
access to academic information, and integrating the system with the Internet has provided users with the tools to view a variety of data elements such as student grades and course enrollments. In addition, the conversion has taken reporting to a new level, with the capability of producing virtually any report to satisfy any question that is being asked. Further, students will soon be able to register at any time through Web-based registration.

Enrollment management also touches upon many areas vital to equity and access. Most important in some ways is the charge to the Admissions Office to increase the proportion of new ethnic minority students by 10% per year for the next four years. While the results of this office’s efforts are described in detail in Chapter 10, it is worth noting here that from Fall 1997 to Fall 2001 applications from first-year ethnic minority students increased 153%, with number of acceptances and paid deposits going up 101% and 269%, respectively. In the broadest sense, the unit also addresses equity and access by attempting to attract adult learners to campus and establishing connections with women’s support groups to develop re-entry programs for women.

The unit supports the campus’ intellectual climate chiefly by recruiting and retaining high academic ability students, promoting developmental programs, offering insight to students and faculty on student development and learning, and providing the faculty with information regarding the entering student profile. Further, COR 101 is designed to enhance student learning and offer an alternative teaching experience to faculty.

Recommendations

In order to help the College continue to offer high quality programs and services within the enrollment management unit, the following actions are recommended:

1. Reaffirm explicitly that recruitment is not the sole responsibility of the Admissions Office, further delineate the roles to be played in this process by deans, department chairs, and faculty, and encourage collective engagement in this process.

2. Build rapport and collaboration with faculty to increase faculty involvement and allow for greater faculty insight and guidance into Advisement Center initiatives.

3. Revise the transfer credit evaluation procedures to include more faculty/advisor ownership and involvement.

4. Establish a stronger base of understanding and participation in the First-Year Program initiative, emphasizing the role of student affairs.

5. Conduct a needs analysis to determine adequacy of resources across enrollment management, to include examination of the need for an inquiry management position and an additional financial aid advisor, professional development and training needs, adequacy of clerical staff, and the need for temporary summer staffing.

6. Build in more participation by enrollment management in the clarification of academic processes and procedures so this unit can become a stronger advocate for the comprehension and implementation of these.
7. Coordinate and promote efforts that will increase student satisfaction and positively affect student retention, to include strategies for identifying and supporting students facing situations that place them at risk for attrition.

8. Evaluate at what point electronic communication may be a requirement for students to perform certain tasks and when a prospective student would be granted access to the student information system.
Faculty

Numbers and demographics. In Fall 2001 SUNY Cortland employed 247 full-time faculty and 251 part-time faculty compared to 200 full-time and 221 part-time faculty in Fall 1996, representing a 23.5% and 25.5% increase in full- and part-timers, respectively. The College has actually made significantly more progress in creating full-time faculty positions than these numbers would suggest, since for Fall 2001 there were approximately 30 unfilled lines, which also helps explain the higher part-time faculty numbers. Searches have begun in an effort to fill the vacant positions for 2002-03, and President Taylor recently announced that ten new full-time faculty positions will be added effective Fall 2002. It is also important to note that many part-time faculty only teach one or two sections, with the result that for Fall 2000 around 67% of all class sections were taught by full-time faculty. Still, this percentage is short of the 80% target established by President Taylor and committed to in the College’s Memorandum of Understanding with System Administration. According to that agreement, SUNY Cortland has until 2004 to meet this objective, but earlier success would help the College meet other staffing pressures resulting from the NCATE and NYSED certification processes, as described in detail in Chapter 14.

With respect to the two schools, in Fall 2001 arts and sciences employed 163 full-time faculty (112 men, 51 women) and 97 part-time faculty (46 men, 51 women). By comparison, this school had 142 full-time (108 men, 34 women) and 97 part-time faculty on staff in 1996, meaning full-time positions have increased by 15% and part-time positions have remained constant. In professional studies, 84 full-time (39 males, 45 females) faculty and 154 part-timers (70 males, 84 females) were employed in Fall 2001 compared to 58 full-time faculty (35 men, 23 women) and 124 part-timers in 1996, representing a 45% and 24% increase in full- and part-time positions, respectively.

One strategy the College has employed since 2000-01 in increasing its total full-time faculty positions has been to create full-time non-tenure track lecturer positions that do not require a terminal degree. Work responsibilities for individuals filling these positions are defined exclusively in terms of teaching, with no scholarship or service expectations. Positions may be renewed for up to three years at a time. To this point, 23 of these positions have been created, with most of the lines located in departments that offer large numbers of introductory courses or have heavy student supervision duties. Specifically, twelve of these lines are in arts and sciences, mostly in departments
like English and international communications and culture, and the other eleven are in professional studies, primarily in education.

As the numbers provided above would suggest, SUNY Cortland has made large gains since 1996 in recruiting and hiring women as full-time faculty. Specifically, overall the proportion of female full-time faculty has increased from 28.5% in Fall 1996 to 38.9% in Fall 2001. Across this same time period, these percentages rose from 23.9% to 31.3% in arts and sciences and from 39.6% to 53.6% in professional studies. With respect to part-time faculty, the proportion of males and females is approximately equal, or 54% female overall (53% in arts and sciences and 55% in professional studies). In 1996 females comprised 51% of the part-time faculty work force.

While not as striking as changes in the gender composition of full-time faculty, there has also been some growth in the percentage of full-time faculty of color at the College since 1996, when that figure was around 9% overall, 13% in arts and sciences, and 5% in professional studies. For Fall 2001, the total number of full-time ethnic minority teaching faculty was 30 (12%), with 24 (15%) in arts and sciences and six (7%) in professional studies. As was the case in 1996, the number of full-time ethnic minority female faculty remains especially low with a total of five, one in arts and sciences and four in professional studies. In 1996, each school only had one female full-time faculty member of color. Similarly, part-time faculty of color for Fall 2001 totaled only eight, or only 3%, compared to around 5% in Fall 1996. Issues associated with hiring and retaining female and ethnic minority faculty and staff are described in more detail in Chapter 10, and there is also relevant information provided below in the discussion of faculty and staff hiring over the last five years.

Qualifications and rank. Of all full-time tenure-track faculty members in Fall 2001, 149 out of 224 (66.5%) were tenured, compared to 69% in Fall 1996 and 74% in Fall 1990, reflecting the impact of professors retiring and being replaced. By school, 73% of full-time arts and sciences faculty in tenure-track lines were tenured compared to 79% in 1996, and this percentage for professional studies in Fall 2001 was 53% compared to 59% in 1996. Ninety-five percent of all full-time tenure-track faculty members in Fall 2001 had received a doctorate or terminal degree, a considerable jump compared to 82.5% in 1996. This percentage for arts and sciences was 96% compared to 87% in Fall 1996 and 92% for professional studies compared to 78% in Fall 1996. For the 23 individuals in the full-time lecturer lines, 21 (91%) had master’s degrees with the remaining two possessing doctorates.

Table 4 below includes comparisons across the years in terms of distribution by rank of full-time faculty in tenure-track positions at SUNY Cortland. Included among the 84 individuals serving at the full professor rank for
Fall 2001 were ten persons (8 males, 2 females, 1 ethnic minority) who have attained the Distinguished Rank as awarded by SUNY System Administration. Specifically, one has been named a Distinguished Professor, SUNY’s highest honor in recognizing faculty scholarship, five have been named Distinguished Teaching Professors, and four have received Distinguished Service Professorships.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Fall 2001, while males accounted for a disproportionate number of those holding the ranks of full professor (83%) and associate professor (58%), these figures represent 6% and 5% declines, respectively, since 1996. In 2001 females accounted for 57% of assistant professors, representing a 15% decrease since 1996. In considering ethnic minority status, in 2001 ten individuals (ten males, no females) held the rank of full professor (compared to eight in 1996), eight (six males, two females) had achieved the rank of associate professor (compared to twelve in 1996), and eleven (seven males, four females) were listed as assistant professors (compared to six in 1996).

Librarians, Professional Staff, and Classified Staff

In the SUNY system librarians are classified as teaching faculty, although at SUNY Cortland librarians have few teaching responsibilities overall. In Fall 2001 the College employed 13 full-time librarians (7 females, 6 males) compared to ten in Spring 1997. The thirteen in Fall 2001 were distributed as follows across ranks: One assistant librarian, eight senior assistant librarians, two associate librarians, and two librarians. Most hold the MLS degree, with two holding doctorates. There is no ethnic minority representation at present on the library staff.

For Fall 2001 SUNY Cortland employed 147 full-time professional staff members (68 males, 79 females) in positions ranging from unit directors to residence hall staff. During that same period, 31 part-timers were serving as professional staff (9 males, 22 females). These numbers represent a 26% increase in full-time professionals since Spring 1997, when there were 117 employed, and a 29% increase in part-timers since Spring 1997, when there were 24 on staff. In Fall 2001, 10 full-time professionals (5 males, 5 females) and one part-time female professional belonged to ethnic minority groups. With respect to the classified work force at the College, 302 (120 males, 182 females) full-time and 53 (18 males, 35 females) part-time workers were employed in Fall 2001. By comparison, in
Spring 1997 there were 272 full-time and 35 part-time classified employees, meaning there has been an 11% increase in full-timers and a 51% increase in part-timers since that time. For Fall 2001, one full-time male, one part-time male, and one full-time female in the classified staff belonged to ethnic minority groups.

Faculty and Professional/Administrative Staff Hiring

Through the 1996-97 academic year, recruiting and hiring activity at SUNY Cortland was minimal, largely due to student under-enrollment in 1995 and 1996 and subsequent budget problems. To illustrate, for Fall 1996 only one full-time faculty member joined the College! Since that time, however, increased enrollments coupled with many retirements by senior personnel have led to a remarkable transformation in the College’s work force, especially among faculty and professional staff, including management/confidential (M/C) employees. Specifically, from Fall 1997 to Fall 2001 128 new full-time faculty, more than half of the total for Fall 2001, were hired. Similarly for that same time period, 160 new professional staff and M/C employees joined the College. It is not surprising, therefore, that Human Resources estimates that approximately 300 searches for these positions have been conducted the last five years!

In addition to gaining new energy and perspectives from all these hires, SUNY Cortland has also been able to significantly increase the number of full-time female and ethnic minority employees in these positions. Figure 5 illustrates these increases with respect to faculty.

Figure 5
Percentage of Ethnic Minority and Female Faculty Hires, 1997 – 2001

Similarly, Figure 6 depicts the number of professional staff and M/C employees hired the last five years, with special focus on the proportion of females and ethnic minority group representatives.
Recruitment Procedures, Personnel Actions, and DSI

Few changes have taken place in college policies that guide recruitment and personnel actions since 1997, so these issues will be described briefly. Recruitment of faculty and professional staff is carried out by the academic departments or offices, and must follow specific procedures described in the College Handbook and the College’s Search Committee Procedures Manual. Filling a full-time position requires a national search (exception for full-time lecturer positions, which may be filled through a regional search), while units may limit their search for part-time faculty or staff to the surrounding area. In replacing professional staff, the “Cortland Plan” may apply, a professional development strategy adopted in December 1986 that makes it possible for current staff to receive priority in applying for and receiving a position.

Chapter 3 contains a description of policies and procedures regulating the renewal of appointments, granting of continuing employment, and promotion for full-time faculty. While there are no uniform, all-College evaluation standards for part-time faculty members, all academic departments must have written standards in place and provide them to part-timers when they are hired. Renewal decisions for professional staff members are made according to a Professional Performance and Evaluation System, approved by the Board of Trustees and the UUP contract. Hiring and personnel actions for classified staff are described by statewide civil service policies and procedures.

Faculty and professional staff members may also be evaluated through the Discretionary Salary Increase (DSI) process, and faculty members are subject as well to college-wide course-teacher evaluation guidelines. Both the DSI and course-teacher evaluation processes are outlined in the College Handbook. DSI is normally available each year there is a contract in place between the State and UUP, and the total available pool of money consists of money.
set aside by the College equal to 1% of the salaries of UUP employees. Information regarding the distribution of DSI monies over the last five years is found in Chapter 13. With respect to course-teacher evaluation, faculty members are required to undergo this process every third time they teach a particular course, with responsibility for monitoring compliance with these procedures largely falling to departments.

Professional Development Activities

Most professional development activities at SUNY Cortland are generally focused upon faculty members, and attempt in particular to provide opportunities that advance their teaching and scholarship. A good example is the College’s sabbatical policy, which allows tenured faculty members every seventh year to take semester-long sabbatical leaves at full pay or full-year sabbaticals at half pay. While such leaves are not typically granted unless a department indicates it can cover the faculty member’s course sections without additional resources, in general the policy is generous, with few applications rejected. Similarly, leaves of absence without pay for faculty are usually granted, as long as the individual’s department is supportive, and are usually requested so that individuals can take advantage of a career-enhancing opportunity. Leaves of absence without pay may also be granted based on personal circumstances. Release time is provided to some faculty members, almost always in exchange for assuming some administrative responsibilities. With respect to travel funds, the deans provide a maximum of $800 annually to untenured faculty and $500 to tenured faculty to present at professional conferences. Although these amounts are unlikely to cover attendance at even one conference per year, they still represent a significant increase since 1997, when untenured faculty received a maximum of $350 per year and tenured faculty received only $300. In addition, there are other funding sources described below that can serve to supplement travel funds provided by the deans.

Institutional efforts to provide professional development activities to faculty and staff have occurred most significantly in the last five years through the activities of the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP), the creation of the College’s Faculty Development Committee, and the College’s long range planning process. The activities of OSP, described in some detail in Chapter 3, include providing faculty and staff with information about external funding sources, sponsoring workshops that allow faculty to develop their proposal-writing skills, helping individuals prepare proposals, and developing and administering various internal awards programs.

Currently, OSP administers four internal grant competitions annually. The Summer Fellowship Program traditionally awards four grants in the amount of $4,000 each to untenured, tenure-track faculty for the summer so that they can devote full-time attention to scholarship without having to teach. The Faculty Research Program
typically awards 10-11 awards annually at an average of $1,000-$3,000 per award, with the specific purpose of this program being the development of seed grants that make it possible for recipients to use their project outcomes as a basis for applying for external funding. The Research and Travel Grant Program receives $6,000 in funding from the Cortland College Foundation, and its intent is to support travel necessary for conducting research and participating in other scholarly activities. Finally, OSP administers the UUP Joint Labor Management Individual Development Awards Program on behalf of the college administration and UUP. These funds, which typically total around $20,000, are used to provide 2-3 professional staff members with release time to pursue career development opportunities, with the rest of the funds distributed to 55-60 faculty and staff members, usually for the purpose of attending conferences. Awards for this group average around $250 per recipient.

In Fall 1997 President Taylor in consultation with the provost established the Faculty Development Committee (FDC), consisting exclusively of faculty members who had received SUNY-wide teaching awards, and charged this group with determining those areas in which faculty most needed assistance and developing strategies for meeting those needs. Since that time, this committee has been an integral component of the College’s attempts to develop a comprehensive approach to faculty development. Examples of activities include conducting a campus-wide needs assessment in Spring 1998, holding a Teaching and Learning Conference at the beginning of each semester which often features a well-known faculty development specialist, sponsoring social events at which faculty can discuss teaching, and holding semester-long “book chats” for faculty that focus on influential texts on pedagogy. More recently the committee has begun to hone in on specific need areas, such as mentoring for junior faculty, strategies for renewing senior faculty, providing workshops for junior faculty on the reappointment and dossier preparation processes, and holding forums for the College’s large part-time faculty. For 2001-02 the group instituted a college-wide award to recognize excellent teaching by part-timers, and it recently developed a comprehensive resource directory describing faculty expertise in specific areas such as assessment, classroom management, cooperative learning, the use of technology in teaching, writing, and the use of student peer review in the classroom.

Professional development opportunities have also been provided through the College’s long range planning process, thanks in large part to contributions made by the FDC. Specifically, for the 2000-02 planning round, a new planning goal was added, “Enhance and support instructional innovation across the College” and action plans were developed for reaching this goal, with the working group developing the plans comprised primarily of the FDC. Major components of this action plan included the creation of a Center for Faculty Development to be overseen by a
faculty member in exchange for .5 release time, dedication of a permanent .5 secretary to the Center, and the creation of by-laws to govern its operations. Other activities consisted of establishing a bi-monthly seminar in innovative teaching, the development of a Faculty Resource Directory described above, developing and maintaining a Faculty Development web page, and offering a small grants program for instructional innovation. Although many of these planned activities are either underway or complete, the College was unable to fund the planning goal to its requested amount due to budgetary constraints. Sufficient funds were provided to establish and furnish a Faculty Development Office and to provide two courses a year release time to the faculty committee chair. In addition, through the long range planning process $27,000 was committed for 2001-02 to hire a .5 secretary on an ongoing but temporary basis and to support other committee activities.

A final professional development initiative to be described relates specifically to the College’s part-time faculty. As a condition of the most recent contract between New York State and UUP, a Part-Time Labor/Management Committee (PTLMC) was formed in Fall 1999, and this group has worked intensively to monitor and improve working conditions for part-time faculty members. These efforts began by administering a survey in Spring 2000 evaluating part-timers’ perceptions of working conditions at SUNY College and requesting suggestions for change. Results indicated general satisfaction with actual work accommodations but demonstrated that part-timers perceived salaries as inadequate, thought they were insufficiently informed regarding college policies and procedures, and desired more job security. Partly on the basis of these findings, the PTLMC has undertaken a number of actions, including the development and publication of the Handbook for Part-Time Academics and Professionals. This group has also promoted the policy of converting part-time to full-time lines, advocated for salary increases for part-time faculty which took place in Fall 2001, sponsored a Part-Time Appreciation Week, and developed an exit survey to be administered to part-timers who leave the College, to be conducted for the first time in Spring 2002.

Analysis

Current Workforce and Qualifications

SUNY Cortland has clearly experienced a substantial increase in its work force in the last five years, with 18.4% more full-time employees and 19.6% more part-timers in Fall 2001 compared to 1996-97. In Fall 2001, the College had close to 1,100 full- and part-time employees on staff, including faculty, professional and administrative staff, and classified workers. There is also good evidence that this work force expansion has been accompanied by an increase in quality, especially for faculty, with 95% of those in tenure-track positions having received a doctorate
or terminal degree compared to 82.5% in 1996. Reflecting the surge of retirements and significant hiring of replacement faculty, there has been some loss in experience, with 66% of full-time faculty at the rank of associate professor and above for Fall 2001 compared to 84% in 1996.

Other changes in faculty composition have taken place as well. As one notable example, while there have been increases in full-time faculty in both schools since 1996, the increase in professional studies has been three times that observed in arts and sciences, 45% compared to 15%. This difference is directly attributable to the stronger and steadier enrollments overall in professional studies, especially in education, physical education, and exercise science and sport studies. Another change that has already had a number of positive implications for the College was the creation of 23 full-time lecturer positions. This action, which grants up to three-year contracts to individuals who may have normally been reappointed on a semester-by-semester basis, has contributed significantly to stability in the adjunct work force and has also served to improve morale in this population as well as in affected departments. It is important to note, however, that these positions do not help the College with respect to student advisement or service, since full-time lecturer positions are defined exclusively in terms of teaching. Clearly, filling the 30 full-time faculty positions that are currently vacant as well as the ten new lines added for 2002-03 will provide significant relief to existing full-timers with respect to advisement and service obligations.

Hiring

Undoubtedly the most positive accomplishment with respect to recruiting new employees to SUNY Cortland the last five years has been its ability to attract females and members of ethnic minority groups, particularly among faculty and professional and administrative staff. The increase in females since 1996 reflects a continuing trend, with the proportion of women in full-time positions growing from 31% in 1990 to 37% in 1996. In considering the increase in ethnic minority employees, it is interesting that these changes were especially marked for faculty the last two years and for professional and administrative staff for 2001. Also, as in 1996 the number of ethnic minority women remains low, which suggests it may be appropriate to develop special recruitment strategies for this group.

In addition to continuing to maintain progress in hiring female and ethnic minority employees, it is important for the College to take action to ensure the retention of those who are hired. Along these lines, as part of the current long range planning round a number of steps were recommended and funded with these objectives in mind, with a total of $17,100 committed for 2000-01 to support the following activities: Providing an affirmative action award to units that are exemplary in this area, developing a support network to assist ethnic minority hires in acclimating to
the Cortland campus and community, the development of special search strategies in units that are underrepresented in this area, and the development of special programs to further advance the College’s affirmative action commitments. An encouraging piece of information related to the retention issue overall is the fact that, according to Human Resources, there has only been 2% attrition to this point of full-time faculty and staff hired within the last three years. In addition, for the last several years Human Resources has conducted an exit interview with full-time employees who choose to leave the College, providing an invaluable source of information for retention purposes. Overall, these interviews indicate that major reasons for leaving include being offered a better position elsewhere and general dissatisfaction with their position at the College. Other factors include salary and personal reasons.

Professional Development Activities

Over the last five years the College has taken numerous positive actions in its efforts to enhance professional and career development opportunities for faculty and staff, including maintaining a generous sabbatical program, increasing travel funds for faculty, creating and supporting the Faculty Development Committee, building teaching innovation into its long range planning process and funding a number of relevant activities under this plan, and increasing efforts to improve conditions for part-timers. It should also be noted that significant changes have been made the last five years in OSP in an effort to increase its impact on the College, most notably the removal of duties in 1997-98 for which this office had formerly been responsible (e.g., Commencement, Scholar’s Day) so that it could focus on its primary mission. Further, a full-time senior grants administrator position was added in January 2001 to help stimulate grant activity across the campus and to assist in the preparation of grant proposals. Another tremendous impetus to faculty development is the $1.75 million Title III grant that began in Fall 2000, with this project providing a significant infusion of funds to support faculty as they incorporate technology and the use of the College’s outdoor education centers into their teaching, revise courses, and develop and offer learning communities.

Still, there is evidence that more resources are required to provide adequate professional development opportunities for faculty and staff, a situation that may exist to some extent because of the large number of junior faculty hired in the last several years. As described in Chapter 3, the academic deans report that faculty morale has been affected negatively in particular by budget constraints that severely limit travel as well as the fact that teaching, advisement, and service responsibilities make it extremely difficult to find time to pursue scholarly and creative pursuits. Such concerns are clearly critical for more junior faculty who need to engage in such pursuits not only for their own intellectual reasons but also in order to be reappointed and receive tenure.
Perhaps the best source of information on these matters was provided recently through a study conducted by OSP, which in Fall 2001 developed and administered a web-based survey to 398 full-time faculty and professional staff members with valid e-mail accounts at the College. The overall purposes of the survey were to determine perceived incentives and barriers to research activity and applying for internal and external funding and to ascertain what activities and services might increase these activities by faculty and staff.

Based on analysis of 88 respondents, results revealed that the factor most perceived as a barrier to scholarly activity was respondents’ teaching load, with this item receiving a mean rating of over 4 on a 5-point scale. Other top-rated factors, exceeding a mean rating of 3.5, were service load (3.74) and inadequate travel budget (3.70). Somewhat encouragingly, no other factor received a mean rating over 3, or “neutral” on the rating scale. Other items found not to be a significant barrier to scholarly activity were adequacy of facilities, lack of administrative, departmental, and dean support, and excessive bureaucratic procedures. With respect to changes that might increase scholarly productivity, respondents gave the highest mean rating to flexible workloads, both at the institutional and departmental levels. The only other factor rated above the mid-point of 3 was clear financial incentives.

Although the OSP survey confirms that certain conditions at the College are operating to suppress scholarly activity based on respondents’ self-reports, it also provides some reason for optimism since these individuals perceive only a few conditions as problematic. In particular, the survey results suggest that SUNY Cortland might stimulate scholarly and creative activity considerably by resolving problems related to teaching load, service responsibilities, and travel funding. One caveat is in order, however, since releasing faculty from teaching to do research frequently takes a college’s best faculty members out of the classroom and would add to SUNY Cortland’s problem attaining its goal of having 80% of its courses taught by full-time faculty. As such, the need to provide release time in exchange for scholarly activity must be balanced with this important institutional priority.

Recommendations

1. Continue to make progress toward goal of having 80% of all courses taught by full-time faculty members.
2. Add full-time lecturer positions as appropriate, taking into consideration the impact of these appointments upon the advisement and service loads of full-time tenure-track faculty in the departments in question.
3. Continue and strengthen efforts to add ethnic minority faculty and staff members, with a focus on females.
4. Continue to support the activities of the Faculty Development Committee and work toward having a Faculty Development Center overseen by a full-time director.
5. Significantly strengthen professional development opportunities for faculty and staff that address the needs of individuals as well as college goals and priorities.
STUDENT AFFAIRS

CHAPTER 6

Description

Programs, Functions, and Services

Mission. The Division of Student Affairs’ mission and that of each of its departments directly support the College’s stated mission. The division’s mission, as it appears on its Web page and in publications, is used to inform students, families, and the college community about programs and services:

The Division of Student Affairs is committed to the personal, social, intellectual, emotional, ethical, and career development of students. By providing high-quality programs and services, the Student Affairs Division enhances the College's ability to realize its mission of teaching, research, and service. The Student Affairs staff work closely with students and faculty to identify students' needs, rights, and responsibilities. In collaboration with colleagues across the campus, the Division develops policies, programs, and services which are student focused, support institutional goals, foster academic learning, and help to develop a sense of community. Working with all members of the community at large, the Division strives to foster a supportive and healthy relationship between the College and the larger Cortland community.

The current mission statement, written by the student affairs directors and vice president in 1995, is reviewed annually and assessed for inclusiveness as programs and departments are added or deleted. In addition, all departments and programs within the division have reviewed and updated individual mission statements during 2000-01 as part of the college-wide assessment program, described in Chapter 9. Departmental goals and objectives are consistent with and supportive of the College’s mission and goals and are reviewed annually and updated by division staff. All programs have clearly stated objectives, specific strategies used to achieve those objectives and appropriate assessment plans in place to measure the degree to which the objectives are reached. Further, individual performance evaluation is a critical exercise in the process of evaluating and adjusting programmatic as well as individuals’ short- and long-term goals and objectives.

History. The College has long recognized the need to provide staffing, programming, and resources that augment the educational experience taking place in the classroom. Numerous reorganizations have taken place in the last ten years with units moving in and out of student affairs and departments and programs being created and
eliminated. For instance, judicial affairs, multicultural affairs, student disability services, and substance abuse prevention and education services were added since the last Middle States review, recreational sports was moved to student affairs from the Physical Education Department, and the Office of Student Life is no longer in existence. In 1997 the Department of Public Safety was moved to student affairs from the finance and management area and, reflecting the change in the status of SUNY peace officers to police officers in January 1999, its name was changed to the University Police Department. In addition, student affairs now supervises summer sports camps as well as the administration of the new multipurpose athletic facility or stadium.

Based on existing national information, the current organizational structure of student affairs at SUNY Cortland is sound. The NASPA Salary Survey, 1999-2000, which includes a review of areas of responsibility under senior student affairs officers, shows that Cortland’s organization is consistent with what is found nationally. It is the case that certain functions like counseling, student health, judicial affairs, and residential services are almost always found in student affairs divisions with others such as the Academic Support and Achievement Program (ASAP), the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), and university police sometimes located elsewhere.

Assessment. While many of the programs within the division have a long history of effective program assessment, noted and praised by the 1992 Middle States external review team, the College’s more vigorous commitment to assessment has resulted in all programs developing and implementing comprehensive assessment plans. Virtually all programs use data from the SUNY-wide Student Opinion Survey (SOS) and the College’s Career Services Graduate Survey to evaluate student use of and satisfaction with services and programs. In addition, many use nationally normed instruments to further assess community satisfaction and usage and the degree to which program goals and objectives are being met. Campus-based assessment tools have been created in nearly all areas to collect more data for program and service assessment, and individual program and service unit reports refer to and include specific assessment measures used across student affairs.

Resources

Human. Student affairs has an outstanding staff of professionals who care about and enjoy working with students, clearly its most important and valuable resource. In all cases, staff members meet or exceed professional standards for academic and professional preparation, and in many cases have a substantial number of years of experience in preparation for their current assignments. Professional performance evaluations are conducted on an annual basis, and together with program assessment support the conclusion that the staff in student affairs is
exceptional. Clerical support and paraprofessional staff are also an important and valuable component of the human resources picture within the division. Full-time clerical staff are chosen through the New York State Civil Service process and in many cases enjoy long tenure once selected. Formal evaluations as per civil service guidelines are conducted and performance in general is excellent. Finally, student staff members work in every office and program, holding routine work-study or temporary service positions in some units while fulfilling more high-level responsibilities in other units. In particular, residential services, recreational sports, ASAP, and CACU rely heavily on students. In all cases, selection, orientation and training, and evaluation programs are in place to ensure that student employees are competent and effective.

**Fiscal.** The division is supported by the State of New York through normal funding and in large part through the IFR programs that exist. While many programs are funded by state tax support, programs such as residential services and student health services are almost entirely supported by student fees. Other programs including university police, counseling, career services, recreational sports, judicial affairs, health education, disability services, and substance abuse prevention and education services have substantial portions of their program supported by student fees. All other programs receive some, if modest, support from alternative funding such as student fees and grants. Currently, of the 96 full-time positions within the division, student fees fund 43 (49.73%) wholly or in part. The total budget for all units within student affairs during 2000-01 was $14.2 million, $12.2 million (85%) of which was generated by student fees with the balance being funded by state allocation. Excluding the residence hall budget from this analysis, 29.9% of the programs were funded through student fees or grants.

Reliance on student fees has increased enormously since the 1992 Middle States reaccreditation. In 1990, for example, student fees totaled $118.50 per semester while today students pay $362, more than a 200% increase. With no tuition increase by SUNY since 1995, these fee hikes were essential to maintain existing programs while at the same time meeting obligatory increases such as negotiated salary raises. Of course, some fees added since 1990 (e.g., technology) were essential for the College to offer programs, services, and equipment deemed necessary for a high-quality experience. Still, new programs and services are limited by lack of direct funding, and must rely on supplemental sources. For instance, state funding for student development programming is negligible, meaning that such programming is largely dependent upon grant assistance from the Auxiliary Services Corporation (ASC), the College Foundation, and the Student Government Association (SGA). During 2000-01, these sources accounted for $513,000 for student development programming at SUNY Cortland. While the College has recently increased
support in some selected areas (e.g., $20,000 in annual funding for multicultural affairs as part of the long range planning process), the division is in critical need of stable, substantial funding if it is to meet future challenges.

**Physical.** Division offices and programs are housed in various locations across the campus, with office locations well suited to their functions in most cases. Many programs are located in the Van Hoesen building which is centrally located and in a heavy student traffic area. The Office of Campus Activities and Corey Union (CACU), judicial affairs, multicultural affairs, and the vice president’s office are appropriately located in Corey Union, while the ASAP is housed in the Memorial Library, a good location although space is limited. The College has considered moving university police from its location in Cornish Hall to an area with more convenient and safer vehicular egress, but has yet to identify an acceptable location.

The major facilities issue within student affairs relates to the need for additional residence hall space as well as a new student recreation center, and proposals for an additional 250-bed residence hall and recreation center are included in the next five-year residence hall capital plan and the College’s next five-year capital plan, respectively. Both of these projects, however, are dependent on student fees to cover design, construction, and operational costs. A residence hall study completed in August 2000 headed by the vice president for student affairs and the vice president for finance and management recommended to President Taylor three options for the construction of additional housing. One option was to acquire additional land adjacent to campus for this construction, while two of the options involved expanding an existing residence hall or building a new facility on campus.

In December 1999 the Student Recreation Center Task Force completed an analysis of the need for a student recreation center on the Cortland campus, concluding that “Cortland should lead the way in SUNY by building a new student recreation center, and at the same time, prove to our students that they do indeed come first.” SUNY Stony Brook has already passed a student referendum to fund such a project. SUNY Cortland is awaiting legislative and Board of Trustee action, which would permit such financing, and is prepared to take this proposal to the students for approval. This plan is contingent, however, on the campus first addressing the need to provide a new or renovated building for its education programs.

**Analysis**

**Congruence Between College Mission and Program Goals**

The Student Affairs Division’s mission directly supports the SUNY Cortland’s mission in multiple ways. Programs such as ASAP and EOP support the College’s academic programs, providing tutoring and other skill-
related courses and activities. Other programs demonstrate congruence with the College’s mission through their counseling and support services and programming, which greatly complement the academic programs and foster students’ personal, social, and intellectual growth. Further, central goals of student affairs include offering programs and services that lead to an appreciation of diversity and a respect for one’s physical and emotional well-being, and division staff are directly or collaboratively involved in dozens of diversity initiatives across campus.

Assessment of Programs, Functions, and Services

Goal attainment. Most student affairs programs have data that clearly demonstrate that their goals and objectives are being met. For example, SOS data from 1994, 1997, and 2000 indicated that students rated recreational and intramural programs the highest across all SUNY campuses. Local data also show a significant increase in student involvement in these programs, with a 35% increase in intramural participants over the last two years, up to 26,172 participants in 1999-2000. In addition, evaluations of judicial affairs’ residence hall presentations for 1999-2000 showed that these programs were very successful, as students rated all aspects of the presentations positively, with over 95% indicating they had gained a better understanding of the campus judicial process. Residential services’ yearly surveys demonstrate effectiveness of staff, programs, and condition of facilities. As one clear sign of success, 79% of students living on campus in Fall 2000 said they enjoyed doing so, compared to 66% in Fall 1999. This increased satisfaction by upper level students who now prefer to stay on campus, however, has led the College to changes its housing policies, as described in more detail below.

Assessment data for ASAP demonstrate the effectiveness of that program, with 100% of students surveyed expressing satisfaction with professional tutoring, workshops, and classroom presentations. Further, retention data for freshmen show a 83.7% retention rate for those students who use ASAP services compared to the overall rate of 76%. The ASAP’s Supplemental Instruction (SI) program targets SUNY Cortland’s most difficult courses, as defined by the percentage of students receiving a grade of “D” or lower, and utilizes student assistants to supplement classroom instruction. Data from this program show that 75% of students using SI express satisfaction with these services. Also, for 1999-00 the proportion of students receiving a “D” or “E” or withdrawing from the course in question was 43% lower for students taking advantage of SI services compared to those who were not.

In addition to information provided through the College’s assessment process, external reviews confirm the quality of programs in student affairs. For example, student health services and the counseling center recently received national certification from their respective accrediting agencies. Similarly, the New York State University
Police Chief’s Association reviewed the SUNY Cortland University Police Department in 2000 and provided a very favorable evaluation, commending this unit in particular for the dedication and talent of its employees.

Other assessment efforts include annual reports that are used to assess units’ goal achievement. In addition, many student affairs staff teach COR 101, and data on students in that course are collected through the Noel-Levitz College Student Inventory (CSI). As described in detail in Chapter 13, the CSI provides much useful information on students and can therefore be very helpful in guiding program development and planning. At present the Student Affairs Division is not using these data as comprehensively or effectively as it might. More informal means of gathering student characteristics data are utilized, such as information provided by judicial affairs, prevention education, student health services, counseling, and university police. A more systematic use of this information as well as that provided by the CSI would strengthen planning and programming efforts considerably.

Revisions based on assessment. Just as student affairs units assess their programs thoroughly on a regular basis, they also use the results of assessment to modify, add, or eliminate program offerings. As one example, for Fall 2001 EOP successfully reestablished a mandatory summer institute for incoming students after analysis of retention data revealed that the proportion of EOP students graduating decreased significantly for classes not required to attend the institute in 1996 and 1997 (e.g., from 38.8% for the 1995 cohort compared to 27% and 22.6% for the 1996 and 1997 cohorts, respectively). Similarly, assessment efforts in career services have resulted in a number of changes, including the introduction of evening hours, offering walk-in hours for resume critiques, the creation of a career services computer lab, and the creation of a Virtual Job Fair for students and alumni.

Strengths, Weaknesses, and Problems

The strengths in student affairs primarily and clearly relate to the quality of people employed in all types of positions coupled with excellent cooperation and collaboration across the division. From the directors and professional staff to the clerical and student support staff, the division is strong. In addition, student affairs has an exemplary system in place for assessing its multiple programs and services, as it did in 1992.

Weaknesses in the division are almost all attributable to fiscal constraints, including the lack of state support described above, which places limitations not only on student development programming but other vital areas such as professional development and education opportunities, the ability to hire sufficient staff in selected areas, and facilities, particularly with respect to providing adequate residence hall space and a student recreation center. Consistently, staff in student affairs express concern regarding the lack of financial support for professional
development. Along the same lines, candidates interviewing for open positions in the division have voiced reservations over what they perceive as minimal support for staff development, and a recent accreditation visit in the Counseling Center identified this issue as a weakness. The dearth of state resources to fund programming seriously undercuts the division’s ability to offer important programs like prevention education, alternative social programming, student leadership development, and cultural arts programming. As a result, students’ co-curricular experiences are not nearly as rich as the College would like. Further, institutional resources to support new needed staff are an ongoing concern for recreational sports, career services, university police, and disability services.

Key problems for SUNY Cortland’s Student Affairs Division include student drinking and drug use, the adequacy of services for a greatly increasing number of students with disabilities, an inability to meet on-campus housing demands in the short term, fragmented recreational sport facilities, and an increase in the seriousness of student misconduct cases.

SUNY Cortland has been studying student drinking and drug use since the inception of a FIPSE grant titled “Project AWARE” in 1994. An examination of data for SUNY Cortland students compared to national data reveals some troubling trends. Specifically, from Spring 1995 to Spring 1999 students at Cortland who admitted to being binge drinkers increased from 64% to 72%, with binge drinkers defined as those who have consumed five or more alcoholic drinks in one setting within the preceding two weeks. By contrast, the national data from 1996 to 1999 showed an increase from 42% to 47%. As one qualification, 55% of the 1999 Cortland sample were freshmen, a highly disproportionate number, so these data may not be entirely representative. Still, local data sources help confirm the impression that alcohol abuse is a problem at the College, with information from the CSI surveys and the Office of Judicial Affairs suggesting that many antisocial behaviors exhibited by our students occur when they are intoxicated. Although these problems are certainly not new or unique to Cortland, the College faces the challenge of changing a student culture that accepts and perhaps even encourages this type of behavior. Chapter 11, which focuses on the campus’ intellectual climate, includes a discussion of positive actions taken by the College to address these problems.

Another problem the College must contend with in the next few years is the growing population of students with disabilities, as the number of these students has increased from 152 in 1998 to 358 in 2001, or 136%. This issue, which is documented in some detail in Chapter 10, is straining current staffing levels in disability services as well as in ASAP. Faculty members are finding it increasingly difficult to accommodate students with disabilities,
especially when there are numerous students needing different accommodations for the same class. Much of the responsibility for providing testing accommodations has fallen to ASAP staff, which is subsequently spending more time supervising test administrations at the expense of working individually with students to improve skills.

As a third challenge facing the College, the high demand for on-campus housing has been both a blessing and a curse, as indicated earlier. While tripling students and denying students campus housing are not consistent with the division’s goal of providing a high-quality residential experience for our students, the College’s enrollment growth coupled with students’ satisfaction with campus housing has left little choice. In the last five years, the number of tripled residence hall rooms has risen from zero to 121 in Fall 2001. While most tripled rooms are de-tripled by mid-semester, the need for additional residence hall space is clear. As another change made reluctantly by the College in this regard, for the first time effective Fall 2000 residential services ended its policy of guaranteeing space to students who wanted to continue living in the residence halls past their sophomore year.

Another challenge for the College relates to an increase in the number of serious misconduct cases as reported by judicial affairs and documented in Chapter 13. Although student affairs has increased staffing and resources dedicated to this issue, the fact that such cases can have devastating effects on individual students as well as the campus community as a whole requires the division to continually develop strategies to prevent and respond to them. The College’s decision in the mid-1990’s to sanction serious off-campus misconduct, while increasing the judicial caseload, has helped improve the climate in the off-campus community. Further, City of Cortland crime statistics show a decrease in the incidents of serious off-campus conduct by SUNY Cortland students.

A final topic for discussion, while not strictly a problem area, is the campus firearm policy, an issue that has resulted in ongoing dialogue between the members of the SUNY Cortland University Police Department and President Taylor. This department has made repeated requests to carry handguns, arguing that its officers deserve access to the same tools as other police officers. Under provisions that changed the status of SUNY “peace officers” to “police officers” in 1999, presidents of individual campuses have full authority to decide if officers should be armed, and 23 other SUNY campuses have armed officers. President Taylor has stated that he is not in favor of arming, asserting that SUNY Cortland officers have policed the campus effectively in the past without arms and that arming might result in harm to innocent people, including officers themselves. The 1998 Memorandum of Understanding between the SUNY Cortland University Police Department and the City of Cortland Police Department clearly delineates duties and obligations for the two units and coordinates their work within the campus.
and the city, with city police responsible for situations in which firearms might be required. Also, some firearms are stored on the SUNY Cortland campus in a secure location in the event of an emergency requiring their use.

**Resources**

**Adequacy.** Since the 1992 Middle States review, the Student Affairs Division has both cut and added professional positions. For example, the director of student life position was eliminated while the coordinator of student disability services, the half-time substance abuse prevention and education coordinator, and the assistant director of judicial affairs position were added. When taking into account all of the organizational changes from 1990 to the present, the programs that have been in the division since 1990 have gained a total of seven full-time positions. Additionally, ASAP gained some institutional support with the conversion of two .88 FTE academic year appointments to two 1.0 FTE 11-month appointments, and university police gained two full-time officers.

As a result of the College’s enrollment increase as well as the heightened needs of some of our students, however, nearly all student affairs programs need additional professional positions, with these needs especially critical in ASAP, disability services, university police, recreational sports, and career services. These staff shortages are particularly evident when SUNY Cortland’s staffing patterns are weighed against those at other comparable SUNY campuses, with Cortland’s student affairs staffing historically low by comparison. For instance, SUNY Cortland may well be the only four-year institution in SUNY without an assistant or associate vice president for student affairs, and career services does not have a director position at this time. Graduate assistants within recreational sports and student directors in Corey Union serve functions that are performed by professional staff at other institutions. In order to reduce personnel costs where possible, 10- and 11-month professional contracts exist, and student employees abound at those times. Not surprisingly, unit heads are deeply concerned with program quality and continuity and are constantly trying to add full-time professional positions.

**Cost effectiveness.** Despite the concerns raised in this report, multiple data sources confirm that students rate SUNY Cortland’s student affairs programs highly. As described above, several programs such as recreational sports are rated first on the SOS, as is the university police with respect to its dissemination of crime statistics. Student health services is rated second on the SOS among the 13 university colleges and this unit and the Counseling Center meet national standards and are nationally accredited. Confident of meeting national standards, ASAP initiated the process of national program accreditation for SI and tutoring this past summer. In short, the quality and quantity of work performed by student affairs staff with existing resources is quite remarkable.
Relationship to Self-Study Emphasis Areas

Student affairs programs relate strongly to many of the special emphasis areas for the Middle States institutional self-study. The division contributes positively to the intellectual climate on campus, primarily through ASAP and EOP, both of which provide academic support and help foster students’ intellectual growth. Further, student leadership award ceremonies recognize academic excellence, residence halls have recognition programs for academic success and minimum grade point averages for all student staff, and student affairs personnel recently began to solicit scholarship support for outstanding student leaders. Student affairs has also worked hard to reduce the anti-intellectual culture of the campus, with recreational sports offering Friday and Saturday evening events as non-drinking alternatives for students. Perhaps most significant was the college-wide leadership played by student affairs in Fall 1999 in eliminating the twice yearly Clayton Avenue block parties that had existed for over 20 years, described more fully in Chapter 14.

Technology gains and utilization in student affairs in the last ten years have been nothing short of phenomenal. Examples include the addition of the Web-based scheduling program in Corey Union, a completely wired residence hall program, computers in university police patrol cars, assisted-technology labs for students with disabilities, and the jobs hot line. There is also a SMART lab in EOP, an updated computer lab in ASAP, greatly expanded use of CD ROM educational programs, and Web pages that describe functions and services for the entire division. With respect to infrastructure, student affairs has been affected most directly and profoundly by residence hall renovation, necessitating a tremendous amount of effort by staff to ensure the best possible outcomes for students. Resulting from all this effort is highly significant improvement in the quality of on-campus housing for SUNY Cortland students. Similarly, the creation of space for the vice president for student affairs in Corey Union and the creation of the student support services suite in Van Hoesen have greatly enhanced the functioning of these programs.

Recommendations

Alternative Approaches

The use of technology within student affairs must continue to develop, with staff pursuing creative approaches that will allow its programs and services to be more widely utilized by students. Developing web-based applications, a career chat room, use of video conferencing, the vigorous pursuit of grant funding to enrich program funding, job-swapping to broaden experiences and freshen people’s perspectives to work, and supporting paid leaves to strengthen skills or improve programs are all examples of alternative approaches the division must employ.
Short-Term and Long-Term Recommendations

In order to help the College continue to offer high quality programs and services within the student affairs area, the following actions are recommended:

1. Expand external grant funding and aggressively seek creative alternatives for supporting programs and services as well as continue to advocate for more state funding.

2. Develop a prioritized re-organizational plan that serves to redefine and create new positions within the division as lines become available.

3. Create strategies for addressing the increased caseload of serious student misconduct both on- and off-campus, so as to improve the campus climate and to reduce the volume of judicial cases.

4. Develop and fund a plan to provide professional development support for student affairs staff.

5. Use CSI data more systematically in order to guide the division’s planning and programming efforts.

6. Develop and fund a plan to address how the campus will continue to effectively serve the increasing number of students with disabilities.

7. Continue to pursue funding options for the construction of a new residence hall and a Student Recreation Center.
Program, Functions, and Services

The Office of Institutional Advancement includes four major components: The Cortland College Foundation, the Office of Alumni Affairs, the Office of Public Relations, and the Office of Publications and Electronic Media. The vice president for institutional advancement provides leadership and direction to the directors of each of these units. The office’s goals and objectives are pursued in partnership with two affiliated non-profit organizations: The Cortland College Foundation, Inc. and the Cortland College Alumni Association.

Goals and Objectives

The overall goal of the Office of Institutional Advancement is to build support for the College’s mission by effectively carrying out the following functions: 1) operating a fund-raising program to generate private (i.e., non-state) funds; 2) conducting a communications program to articulate the College’s mission; 3) building life-long relationships with alumni; and, 4) producing publications and web sites that advance the College’s mission, especially directed to donors, alumni, parents, legislators and prospective students. At present, much of the activity in these four units is focused on carrying out the College’s first capital campaign. The “Campaign for Cortland” began with its silent phase in 1998 with the intention of generating $10 million, and in Fall 2001 entered its public phase after around $6 million had been raised.

History and Organization

Institutional advancement was formed in 1996 through a reorganization President Taylor initiated one year after his arrival, with the goal to position the College to interact more effectively with external constituencies. Prior to that time the Office of College Relations and Development focused for the most part on conducting a public relations, sports information, publications, and alumni affairs program. The annual fund was supervised by the director of alumni and foundation affairs, and produced only $371,000 in total private giving in 1995. In early 1996, the president announced the priority to launch an aggressive fund-raising effort to address the decline in state support and the concomitant need to obtain private funding for student scholarships and faculty support.

In August 1996, the new position of executive director of institutional advancement was filled, with this position upgraded to a vice presidency in 1998. Reorganization also resulted in two upgraded directors positions in
the functional areas of public relations and publications. In consultation with the Cortland College Foundation, Inc., and based upon the recommendations from a campaign feasibility study conducted by Barnes and Roche in 1998, the new position of executive director of the College Foundation was created in 1999 and filled in 2000. President Taylor committed this new state-funded senior development position, along with an annual giving professional position and clerical position in 2000 from state resources, to enhance fund-raising efforts. Although initial turnover in both these professional positions led to a loss of progress on the planned development calendar, there has been a remarkable increase in private giving since 1995 as described in the analysis section below.

Assessment

All units in institutional advancement have assessment plans as required by the College’s assessment program. Fund-raising assessment is done annually by comparing gift income audits with those of Cortland’s SUNY peer institutions and through the national Council for Aid to Education Report. Individual campaign assessments are completed internally through the use of Raisers Edge software reports to determine the effectiveness of various methods of solicitation (e.g., alumni mailings, phonathons, corporate matching gift programs). Program changes and schedule adjustments are made after analysis discussions are completed at the annual Foundation staff retreat. For example, an aggressive planned giving program is being initiated due to low revenue in that particular category.

Other assessment measures include alumni participation rates, which are studied annually both in terms of rate of contributions and involvement in reunions, chapter events and alumni programs. Satisfaction of attendees at events is assessed to assure program effectiveness. The Public Relations Office conducts readership surveys of alumni readers of Columns, the College’s major periodical for alumni, and monitors the number of press releases printed by local and regional media outlets. The Publications and Electronic Media Office receives feedback on its major publications as well as the college web site. The vice president of institutional advancement’s office assessment plan includes measures for evaluating coordination among these units on joint projects. This plan also monitors progress made on the capital campaign timetable and resulting gift income, increases in applications due to marketing initiatives through publications and public relations, and goal achievement through the two affiliated boards.

Resources

Since 1995 there has been a major investment in new professional positions in institutional advancement, with a doubling of the size of the professional staff from six positions in 1995 to 13 today. President Taylor, through state
and private resources and in partnership with the Foundation and Alumni Association boards, has approved this expansion not only in development, but also in the other program areas in order to enhance recruitment, communications, and development goals. Due to this increase in staff, in July 1998 institutional advancement moved from Brockway Hall to Studio West’s surge facilities on a temporary basis, and a major renovation of Brockway Hall is targeted for completion in 2004. On another facilities-related matter, the Alumni Association continues its search for an alumni house, first announced as an organizational goal in its 1968 Long Range Plan.

With respect to fiscal resources, as fund-raising in institutional advancement has generated more unrestricted income, the Foundation and Alumni Association have obtained a proportional increase in operating budgets from private sources. State funding of supplies and expenses for public relations and publications programs has increased by 50 percent, but not in proportion to the private funding increases.

Analysis

Congruence Between College Mission and Program Goals

There are multiple ways in which institutional advancement seeks to make certain that its programs are consistent with and serve the College’s mission. For instance, President Taylor has engaged in active dialogue with the leadership boards of the Foundation and Alumni Association since his arrival in 1995 to ensure congruence between institutional priorities and the goals of these organizations. These boards were kept informed of the College’s Mission Statement revisions three years ago and invited to participate in the process, and the Alumni Relations program held board retreats with the president’s participation to endorse the revised statement. Similarly, the College’s long range planning goals have emphasized the need for increased private support since 1996, and many specific action plans were put in place to achieve the current record of development success. Further, faculty members have become increasingly involved in development initiatives that support the College’s academic mission, and some departments have active alumni advisory councils.

In an especially significant development, retreats were held last year with President Taylor and the Foundation Board to agree on the fund-raising priorities established by the Mission Statement for the College’s capital campaign, concluding with the Foundation Board’s personal gift commitment in December 2000 of more than $.75 million and several major planned gifts. Specific Mission Statement priorities reflected in the capital campaign include the campaign’s goal to build endowments for access and opportunity scholarships, a faculty development program, international and technology-based programs, and campus cultural life and diversity initiatives.
Some final examples relate to public relations and publications and electronic media programs, which use the College’s Mission Statement priorities as a communications template in all marketing initiatives. These offices also serve the institution’s mission by supporting accurate catalog production, keeping faculty informed through the biweekly publication of the internal newsletter *The Bulletin*, and educating external audiences about institutional priorities by producing *Columns* four times a year. In 1996 publications and electronic media developed a new Graphic Standards and Style Manual, which is used to present a unified image of the College, particularly to external constituents.

**Assessment of Programs**

Many performance measures exist to support the extraordinary effectiveness of institutional advancement and its units in recent years. As shown in Figure 7, from 1995 to 2000 annual private giving increased from $371,000 to about $2 million per year, followed by a slight decline in 2001 primarily as a result of steep stock market declines beginning in 2000. The major fund-raising goal of securing at least $2 million per year was largely achieved according to the bottom line audit reports submitted annually to the president and Foundation Board. These results are published in the Annual Report of the Foundation and sent to 50,000 friends, alumni and donors.

**Figure 7**

*Total Private Giving from 1995 – 2001*

During the 1999 campaign year, the latest for which information is available on SUNY peer institutions, SUNY Cortland reported a 14.7% raw participation rate in annual giving and an 18.6% solicitation effectiveness ratio, or donors as a percentage of alumni solicited. By comparison, the national average of this ratio for master's level public institutions was 12.5%. SUNY peer institutions ranged from a low of 9.6% at Brockport to 37% at Oswego
for solicitation effectiveness, but Cortland ranked number one in average size of alumni gift at $129.19 per donor, followed by Potsdam at $115.

Another performance measure that clearly demonstrates the success of institutional advancement is the dramatic increase in campus-based support for private scholarships resulting from fund-raising. Figure 8 shows this growth, with an increase in support from $95,000 in 1995 to $750,000 in 2001. As a result of this success, in Summer 2000 SUNY Cortland received the national Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) Award for overall fund-raising improvement in the CASE Circle of Excellence program.

Figure 8
Total Campus-Based Funding for Private Scholarships, 1995-2001

As further evidence for the effectiveness of institutional advancement, national awards programs such as CASE and the SUNY Council for University Affairs and Development have publicly recognized the high quality of SUNY Cortland’s recent recruitment publications. In addition, the 1999 readership survey conducted by public relations with assistance from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment revealed strong satisfaction with Columns.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The major strengths supporting the institutional advancement program include strong positive alumni feelings towards SUNY Cortland, as indicated by alumni giving rates, reunion attendance, and participation in other alumni events. President Taylor’s leadership of and involvement in institutional advancement programs, including Foundation Board events and regional alumni chapter events from California to Florida, have also been critical to the office’s success, ensuring that these programs are not viewed simply as ancillary. Other strengths include a growing resource base, counteracting a long period of inadequate funding of institutional advancement programs
and activities, as well as growing recognition by key faculty leaders that their programs require alumni involvement and gift support to thrive (e.g., recreation and leisure studies, chemistry). In addition, in recent years institutional advancement has worked increasingly in major project planning with the Office of Sponsored Programs in order to advance projects that require major outside support (e.g., Raquette Lake, CURE scholarships, faculty equipment purchases, Title III grant match) and, in fact, the vice president for institutional advancement is the director for the Title III grant’s endowment-building activity. Finally, institutional advancement is very fortunate to have supportive and generous affiliated board members who are committed to joint planning with the president.

Institutional advancement also faces challenges in its efforts to achieve programmatic goals. First, turnover in the Foundation and Annual Giving director positions in 1999-2000 made it impossible to meet the capital campaign time line recommended by Barnes and Roche. There is also concern over the low satisfaction levels SUNY Cortland students express on SUNY-wide assessments compared to students at peer institutions with respect to issues like advisement, diversity, and the extent to which faculty provide engaging classroom experiences. These perceptions are revealed on both the Alumni Outcomes Survey and the Student Opinion Survey, and are unlikely to lead to generous alumni giving rates in future years. Another problem is the fact that private philanthropy for public institutions only became a SUNY priority in the early 1980’s, and only at SUNY Cortland in the mid-1990’s under President Taylor’s direction, meaning the College has much ground to make up compared to its peers. This sense of urgency can run counter to the relationship-building philosophy of successful, long-term development programs.

Resources

As indicated above, the College has infused significant resources into development, especially from 1996 to 1998 when the president and Foundation Board agreed that an investment in added staffing would produce greater private giving. This investment has clearly paid off, resulting in dramatically increased fund-raising and a far more effective development program. With specific reference to the capital campaign, most major pledges will be paid by 2004 in order to reach the $10 million endowment goal. The Annual Fund will be raising 10% more each year in unrestricted gifts, which will assist in SUNY Cortland’s ability to provide merit scholarships. Similarly, the publications program was expanded to include electronic media when it was determined that the College’s web site required a serious upgrade in order to attract the attention of high-ability applicants and the interest of devoted alumni donors. A graphic designer position was also added due to campus input regarding the high cost and slow response time of off-campus design firms, resulting in savings of at least $25,000 per year in payments to off-
On the basis of readership survey results that indicated readers viewed *Columns* as the College’s primary communications tool, this publication received more institutional staff and fiscal support. The reorganization and expansion of the Alumni Affairs program resulted from long range plan discussions with President Taylor, the vice president for institutional advancement, and the Board. Studies of comparable alumni programs were also completed to assess the effectiveness of program expansion on alumni satisfaction rates, resulting in the addition of two new regional alumni chapters per year and increasing numbers of alumni participation at events and in annual giving.

Still, as campus demands continue for more targeted enrollment recruitment publications and more current program web sites, ongoing investments in personnel resources will be needed. The College’s Web Advisory Team has analyzed the need for a full-time web manager, and recently recommended to the President’s Cabinet that this position be added. Foundation resources are still deficient with respect to major and planned gift officers, according to the original recommendations of the Barnes and Roche consultants. The Public Relations Office has requested an additional professional and clerical position in order to enhance press release development, *Columns* production, *Bulletin* distribution, and mailing of the *President’s Update*. The Alumni Association is staffed adequately, but operating budget resources are an annual challenge, particularly from the Foundation. Finally, the Foundation’s ability to fund merit and non-endowed scholarships on an unrestricted basis (e.g., Presidential, Leadership, and Cortland’s Urban Recruitment of Educators or CURE awards) is increasingly problematic due to the vagaries of financial investment markets and the fact that donors are restricting more gifts to their own favorite projects.

**Cost Effectiveness**

As a fledgling development program, SUNY Cortland’s cost to raise a dollar is higher than the $.16 national average. The College’s annual fund-raising costs have ranged between $.25 to $.35 but are moving lower, and will be far lower in the public phase of the capital campaign. Based on information provided in 1990 by the National Association of College and University Business Officers, the national average for institutional advancement expenditures was around four percent of an institution’s budget. In 1997 total operations for SUNY Cortland’s institutional advancement office, including personnel and supplies and expenses funded through both state and private funds, was only 1.5% of the College’s budget. By 2001, that percentage had increased to 2%, reflecting the new financial support committed by President Taylor.
Relationship to Self-Study Emphasis Areas

The functions of institutional advancement relate directly to most of the special emphases in the Middle States institutional self-study. Need-based scholarship funds raised by the Foundation address student access issues, and institutional advancement has played a pivotal role in helping establish and maintain the College’s highly innovative CURE program for ethnic minority students interested in teaching in urban centers. This program, more fully described in Chapter 10, has assisted greatly in diversifying the SUNY Cortland student body, with 35 of these scholarship recipients now on campus. A number of successful fund-raising projects have assisted women’s athletics and scholarships specifically for women, such as the Women’s Endowed Scholarship in Physical Education. Also, public relations and publications and electronic media assist in press release production and publications for special diversity initiatives like the ethnic minority recruitment brochure. The Alumni Affairs Office is a co-sponsor of the ethnic minority alumni invitational dinner, and *Columns* regularly features successful ethnic minority alumni profiles.

The Foundation positively contributes to the College’s intellectual climate through funding grants that support faculty members’ research, professional development opportunities, merit scholarships for high-ability students, special events like the Cheney Educational Issues Conference, and the Concerts and Lecture Series annual program. The Rozanne Brooks Dedicated Teacher Award is granted through the Foundation annually to recognize an outstanding faculty member with a generous stipend. The Campaign for Cortland seeks 20% of its goal for an endowment to assist faculty development, 50% for merit and need-based scholarships, and 5% to endow concerts and lectures.

In the area of technology, computer hardware and software upgrades take place continuously in the Foundation and Alumni offices (e.g., for the Raisers Edge database) and the public relations and publications and electronic media offices for design software, photo editing, and desktop publishing. Further, technology funding from private sources is a priority in the capital campaign, and several initiatives are underway to secure funding for faculty technology through the Title III match, Raquette Lake programs and the *Dragon Planet*, an international web-based magazine housed at the College. Prospect research using technology has helped to raise more funds from alumni, and institutional advancement spearheaded the recent redesign of the College’s web site, using an off-campus vendor to advance recruitment efforts and strengthen the uniform look of admissions publications.
Both internal needs and external pressures have served to motivate the Campaign for Cortland. Diminishing state and federal support of student aid has placed a priority on private access scholarships for need-based aid. Constraints on state budgets have caused the Foundation to place a high priority on faculty funding needs for travel, research, equipment, and development with only a modest increase in funds raised to date. Title III federal matching funds, totaling $326,800, will help the Foundation to leverage private gifts for these needs in the capital campaign. The Publications and Electronic Media Office has been overwhelmed with requests for enrollment-related initiatives during the past five years, but this demand may diminish as enrollment stabilizes. Overall, the College has become far more dependent upon external sources of funding and community and legislative support, prompting heightened demands for the expansion of institutional advancement services.

Finally, with respect to infrastructure institutional advancement operations have benefited greatly from the availability of surge office space in Studio West to accommodate staff expansion. The distance of this facility from most client groups in the administration and faculty, however, has caused some program inefficiencies and communication problems. When Brockway Hall is renovated in 2004 these difficulties will cease. An Alumni House facility continues to be an institutional advancement priority, so as to infuse the campus culture and student awareness with the history and traditions of an institution that is more than 130 years old. An acquisition attempt failed in 2000 due to community opposition, but an Alumni House remains a priority in the Alumni Association’s Strategic Plan.

Summary and Recommendations

Institutional advancement is in effect SUNY Cortland’s sales and service office. Big gifts come from big ideas. The College’s development program will continue to grow if capable institutional advancement staff are engaged and if faculty and staff continue to care about their students and to develop exciting opportunities for philanthropy to make a difference in transforming lives. The alumni program will succeed if those opportunities are communicated well, resulting in the development of meaningful relationships. Public relations and publications and electronic media programs will support those advancement efforts, primarily through coverage of faculty and student accomplishments, but only with the continued investments of resources on a scale proportionate to the campus’ needs that enable those units to produce high quality publications and a first-rate web site.
Alternative Approaches

There is no substitute for the personal approach to fund-raising, although technology can enhance the quality of the re-bonding experience with alumni. Therefore, there are few alternatives to the Foundation’s attempt to humanize the College’s development program by providing quality interactions with student callers, alumni volunteers, and competent staff members. Cultivating good relationships and rapport with top donor prospects and convincing them about the good planning and management of SUNY Cortland will ultimately lead to a large investment of private giving. Advancements in technology, however, will certainly enhance the efficiency of the public relations and publications and electronic media programs.

Short-Term and Long-Term Recommendations

In order to help the College continue to offer high quality programs and services within the institutional advancement units, the following actions are recommended:

1. Continue and expand the use of private funds to recruit and retain high quality students and faculty so as to ensure the success of private fund-raising efforts in the future.

2. Grow the number of alumni chapters to increase national visibility and outreach and provide more alumni career guidance to students.

3. Secure an alumni house.

4. Expand support for web site maintenance.

5. Continue to provide enhancements in public relations and publications and electronic media in the form of technology and personnel, through the addition of clerical and professional positions.
FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT

CHAPTER 8

VICE PRESIDENT FOR FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT

Description

Brief Description and Organization

The Office of Finance and Management at SUNY Cortland is responsible for managing fiscal, human, and physical resources at the College. Its mission is to ensure the fiscal integrity of the campus and the physical integrity of the buildings and grounds, and to ensure that services are provided in the most responsible and cost-effective manner possible. The office is headed by the vice president for finance and management (VPFM), who oversees the associate vice president for finance, the associate vice president for facilities management, and the director of human resources. In addition, the VPFM serves as the College’s liaison with the Child Care Center on campus, as well as with the Auxiliary Services Corporation (ASC).

Substantial reorganization has taken place in the past five years. In 1999, the unit added the associate vice president for facilities management, who supervises the areas of physical plant, facilities planning, and environmental health and safety. In addition, custodial workers in the residence halls were shifted from reporting to the director of residence life to the director of physical plant. With the retirement of the associate vice president for finance and management in 2000, that position was retitled associate vice president for finance to more accurately reflect the areas reporting to this position, the Business Office, student accounting, and budget. Other structural changes were made in that unit to increase effectiveness and ensure good internal control. The present section includes a summary of operations within human resources, the child care center, and ASC, followed by sections within this chapter that focus on the business office and facilities management.

Human Resources

Human resources is staffed by four professionals and four support staff. Resources allocated to the department are generally adequate, allowing the periodic upgrading of technology and professional development opportunities for all staff members. Over the past decade, human resources has seen significant expansion of its responsibilities, with a major change the assumption of the College’s affirmative action function in 1997. Operations have also been affected by major legislative mandates during this time, such as the Family and Medical Leave Act and the Omnibus Transportation Employee Testing Act. New bargaining agreements brought changes in policy and benefits, one
more employee group gained collective bargaining recognition, and seven early retirement incentive programs were enacted since 1994. Around 185 employees took advantage of these programs, resulting in a need for heavy benefits and retirement counseling and to fill a large number of faculty and staff positions. Since 1992, 360 classified positions have been filled and over 300 faculty and professional and administrative staff searches conducted.

**Child Care Center**

SUNY Cortland is fortunate to have an excellent child care center, which was accredited by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) in 1996 and which provides high quality child care to students, faculty and staff. The center, which opened in 1993, provides care for up to 66 children in a spacious bright location equipped with large indoor and outdoor play areas. The center is run as a non-profit corporation and is represented on its Board of Directors by parents, staff, and students. The presence of the center and its mission meshes well with the College’s mission and institutional goals. With the College’s very large education program which includes an early childhood education concentration, many students have their first exposure to field work at the center as part-time employees or volunteers. The fact that the center is accredited and engages in ongoing self-study and assessment ensures that students get a chance to see how a quality child care facility is operated. Although the center’s budget is generally adequate, it is somewhat too dependent on fluctuating grant funding.

**Auxiliary Services Corporation**

Auxiliary services at SUNY Cortland are run through the Auxiliary Services Corporation (ASC), a self-sustaining, not-for-profit corporation governed by a membership of 27 representatives of SUNY Cortland students, faculty and staff. The management of ASC has a comprehensive strategic planning process in place, which is discussed with the board and translated into lists of action items with identifiable targets and completion dates. ASC recently underwent a full year of union organizing activities and collective bargaining, culminating in June 2000 with the ratification of a labor agreement between CSEA and ASC, which extends through June 2003. This agreement will provide some stability in labor relations in the next few years.

**Analysis**

**Congruence Between College Mission and Program Goals**

From careful analysis it is apparent that the mission of the College and the goals and objectives of the units overseen by finance and management are in complete agreement. As service units, these areas support the mission in integral ways, though not necessarily readily apparent. The facilities management unit in particular has latched
onto the “making a difference” phrase from the College Mission statement, making it a part of all their literature as well as their daily attitude.

Assessment of Programs, Functions, and Services

Finance and management, beginning with the vice president’s office, is committed to ongoing assessment of all its operations and has performance indicators in place for virtually all programs, functions, and services. As part of the College’s assessment program during 2000-01, all finance and management units successfully carried out and presented their assessment plans, with no unit required to provide follow-up information. All these plans and completed assessment reports are on file in the Middle States office.

It should also be noted the College’s fiscal affairs are regulated according to SUNY and State of New York policy, and are constantly under review from both within and outside the institution. As examples, college accounts are kept on the SUNY accounting and budget system, and are also maintained through shadow budgets on campus for good management information. In 1999, SUNY Cortland had a full audit by the Office of the State Comptroller, and all exceptions have been corrected. Recent audits of the College, the ASC, the Student Government Association, the Research Foundation, and the Child Care Center are on file in the Middle States office. The associate vice president for finance is designated as the institution’s internal control officer.

In addition, finance and management units have undertaken a number of quality initiatives to foster cooperation among its own units and with other departments across campus to maximize functionality and to leverage resources. One example is the Task Force on Technology Installation, which brings together personnel from physical plant, facilities, and information resources on a regular basis to plan projects such as computer laboratory installations and to resolve existing difficulties. Minutes of these meetings are distributed to all relevant personnel, with unresolved problems brought to the vice presidential level, a process that has proved to be extremely effective.

Though not required to participate in the College’s formal assessment process, the Child Care Center regularly surveys enrolled families to see how needs are being met, and makes changes on that basis. NAEYC accreditation also involves a comprehensive process of internal self-study and professional review. Similarly, the ASC management communicates with its customers, primarily students, on an ongoing basis through the web, student newspaper, focus groups and advisory panels. In addition, annual surveys are administered which track satisfaction with the food plan. Feedback from the survey has resulted in changes to the meal plan, hours of operation, product mixes, and menu items. A more complete summary of ASC survey results is found in Chapter 13.
Strengths, Weaknesses, and Problems

**Strengths.** Since the 1997 Middle States Periodic Review Report was prepared, a number of highly positive changes have taken place that have served to bring the College much needed fiscal stability. Of particular note is a significant increase in reserve funds for the institution. After several bad budget years, at the beginning of 1998 the College’s goal was to have a reserve of 2% of all funds, or about $1.2 million. While that goal seemed almost impossible to achieve at the time, the institution has actually managed to greatly exceed that target, while also growing some dedicated reserves for residence hall rehabilitation and energy costs. The reserve has allowed SUNY Cortland to fund some one-time expenses, and to take some chances in planning for future years. For example, the College often does not know what its budget will be before the fiscal year begins and since decisions to recruit faculty for the following academic year must be made far in advance, reserves enable the institution to hire the faculty, knowing that this surplus can cover the salaries if necessary.

Of course, building up the College’s reserve to this extent could have only taken place through careful stewardship of resources and monitoring of budgets, another strength of the unit. The fact that there has been no substantial infusion of extra state funding into the College’s budget for several years has made such care essential. New allocations are made using an incremental approach for other-than-personal service (OTPS) expenditures, and only after close review for personnel expenditures to ensure that resource reallocation is considered where warranted. In requests to replace or add positions, departments must justify their need on the basis of workload and enrollment. As another achievement, the College has made every effort the last three years to link its budget to the institution’s long range plan. This process, detailed in Chapter 9, has led to the prioritization of activities called for under the long range plan and therefore decision-making that can be made readily and on an ongoing basis.

SUNY Cortland has also been very successful in its attempts to tap alternative funding sources the past five years. A negotiated contract with Coca-Cola through ASC resulted in funds to be used for faculty development, the new stadium, and an extensive scholarship program. In addition, since SUNY institutions are not allowed to discount tuition or use state funds for scholarships, it was critical to obtain external monies for innovative projects such as the CURE program. Another source of alternative funding has resulted from the College’s legislative delegation through member items, and it was in this manner that the College received funding for the new stadium outside of the normal capital budgeting process. For an institution whose budget is based exclusively on enrollment, another method of generating new money is by saving it. SUNY Cortland has managed to do so by substantially
decreasing energy usage over the past five years, with virtually all these savings directed back into other college programs. Additional smaller initiatives have contributed as well, such as the leasing of space on the College’s smokestack for cell antennas and the reclamation of huge amounts of storage space on campus for program use, saving resources in renovation and construction. Finally, it has been necessary to increase student fees in some areas, notably athletics and technology, as well as the addition of fees where there was good justification, as in the creation of transportation fee to fund a comprehensive transit system.

Another strength relates specifically to changes in the campus infrastructure. While this topic is addressed thoroughly in Chapter 15 and to some extent below in the section on facilities management, it is important to note that more capital projects were completed in the past three years at SUNY Cortland than had been taken on in the previous ten years! This work resulted from a five-year capital program started in 1998 as well as from the funding received for the stadium facility that same year. Overall, these efforts have had a remarkable impact, helping resolve such issues as disability access and maintenance that had been deferred for far too long and resulting in a campus that is much safer, and more functional and aesthetically pleasing. Facilities management has also attempted to make future construction even more efficient by implementing design standards and protocols.

Weaknesses. As the above discussion would suggest, finance and management has made remarkable progress in the last five years, providing a degree of fiscal stability and overseeing a level of facilities improvements that would have been difficult to imagine in 1997. Through ongoing assessment, however, it is also clear that several areas are in need of improvement, with strategies for making these improvements already underway. First, better budget systems and processes need to be implemented at the College, in large part because SUNY’s accounting system is not a good budget tool. Further, while the shadow budget systems that have been developed are adequate for operational purposes, they do not provide the level of useful, dynamic information that is desirable for data-driven decision making, largely because it is difficult for the College and departments to monitor current expenses by unit on an ongoing basis. By improving the budget system, it would be possible to track and analyze issues such as the different student fees and the specific needs these fees support, with priority given to reviewing the technology fee and budget. Another area currently being examined that needs more structure and decentralization of responsibility involves the budgeting for adjunct faculty. An initiative began last year to standardize salary scales and practices in this area, and this effort should continue. Finally, it would benefit the institution greatly to develop and implement a mechanism through which the campus overall has more input into the budget process, a point also
made in Chapter 3. In recognition of this need, for the first time in Fall 2001 individual budget requests were solicited from all units for the 2002-03 academic year, with units given the opportunity to make a case for funding above and beyond a standard inflationary increase.

Areas targeted for improvement were also described in the individual reports submitted by units to the VPFM for the Middle States self-study process. As an example, human resources cited the need to work with the college administration to improve the way in which staffing needs are determined and met. In particular, it appears that better planning would result in higher quality applicant pools, and also enhance the timeliness and efficiency of the search and appointment processes. In addition, automation of the appointment process would be beneficial.

Problem areas. A major challenge managing the fiscal and physical resources at the College over the past few years is the growth of the institution which has resulted in heavy utilization of the campus, increased demand for services, an expanding need for resources, more personnel searches, and the necessity of forcing efficient space utilization. There are budget implications as well since the SUNY budget formula funds campuses on a three-year weighted average, meaning that an institution like SUNY Cortland that is growing is funded on a lagged basis. Further, institutions receive no state funding for any enrollment that exceeds 2% of target. From 1997 to 2000 the College’s enrollment climbed steadily from 5,181 AAFTE to 5,828, more than 11%, yet it was funded on the basis of a rolling average of 5,411. Although this situation will improve over the next year or so as enrollment levels out and the rolling average catches up with reality, it has been difficult to maintain quality and serve the growing student population. Figure 9 below depicts the situation of rolling as opposed to actual enrollments the last four years.

Figure 9

Funded Enrollment Vs. Actual Enrollment, 1996-2001
Directly related to this issue are the multiple changes that have occurred in the SUNY budget allocation system since the College’s last Middle States reaccreditation. From 1985-95 System Administration operated on a benchmark system with a 40-cell matrix that principally took into account enrollment but included other factors such as size of physical plant and utilities. From 1995-97, no formulas were run and budgets were increased or decreased incrementally. In 1998, a new budget methodology was used for the first time. Now known as Performance Based Budget Allocation (PBBA), this approach relies solely on enrollment data, calculated on a weighted three-year average, and on classification of those data into student credit hour distribution by level and discipline. Chapter 14 contains a detailed description of how PBBA works, but the point should be made here that this system places SUNY Cortland at a serious disadvantage, largely because our biggest programs (e.g., education) are classified as low cost at the upper-division and graduate levels. This problem is exacerbated significantly by new NYSED regulations which make the College expend more resources on programs for which it is receiving minimal funding. PBBA also penalizes SUNY Cortland disproportionately because it makes no provision for programs or facilities that do not generate academic credit. The College has two very expensive programs in particular, its large Division III athletics program and the Outdoor Education Center at Raquette Lake, which add substantially to students’ educational experience but generate no funding through PBBA.

Other challenges finance and management faces include the fact that the percentage of budget used for OTPS expenditures has not improved greatly in recent years, a problem noted by Middle States in its last review. This percentage in the state budget in fact continues to decline, not surprising in a system in which the campus is not charged for fringe benefits on the state accounts but is charged over 30% for employees paid from IFR or DIFR accounts. As a result, some campus accounts have very high levels of OTPS expenditures, while the state account is dominated by personnel costs. Still, as explained in more detail below, the overall percentage of OTPS expenditures taking an all-funds approach is well above 20%.

Another concern worthy of mention is the change over time in the number and distribution of state employees across functional areas. Due to cutbacks necessitated by decreases in the state budget over the past decade, the overall level of state staffing has dipped from 687 to 615 FTE today. Further, while total number of faculty and maintenance and operations (M&O) staff have declined during that time, student services and support service personnel have actually increased. In part these trends reflect the advent of technology on campus and the support computers require as well as increasingly complex governmental regulations that make it more labor-intensive to
process student information. The loss of faculty and M&O staff over that ten-year period, however, is disturbing
given the College’s need to add full-time faculty lines and to maintain a large physical plant. It is encouraging that,
as described in Chapter 5, SUNY Cortland has made up some of this loss, employing 23.5% more faculty, 26%
more professionals, and 11% more classified staff in full-time positions in 2001 compared to 1996-97.

Additional problems related to the campus infrastructure also require attention, including the use of space, as
changes in enrollment patterns and functionality have not always meant changes in space usage. An analysis has
been conducted of how space is currently used, but this information needs to be compared against a common space
standard, and there has to be consensus reached regarding a long-term space allocation plan. In addition, a
cooperative effort is needed between finance and management and academic affairs to identify programs that could
be held at off-campus sites and to identify potential facilities, allowing the College to grow its current physical plant
and at the same time making graduate education more accessible for teachers in the region.

Both ASC and the Child Care Center also included facilities-related concerns in their Middle States reports.
ASC owns the Antlers Camp, a lakeshore facility that provides access to the College’s historic Camp Huntington in
the Adirondacks, and it has invested significant funds into this camp in recent years for renovations such as septic
system improvements, new roofs, and underground fuel storage facilities. Still, there is substantial work to be done,
a continuing problem since ASC does not come close to meeting costs at Antlers. Strategies are needed for
increasing the utility of this site for educational purposes and for improving income and cost effectiveness.
Similarly, there is no space left for expansion at the Child Care Center’s current site on the first floor of a residence
hall complex. If demand continues to grow for the Center’s services, alternative venues may need to be considered.

A final problem area relates to the recent fluctuations in energy costs. While SUNY Cortland has been able to
lock in gas prices at times, these ongoing fluctuations cause severe planning problems. There has been no new state
support for energy costs in the last five years and the College, in conjunction with its sister institutions, has
petitioned System Administration to work with the state legislature to provide fiscal relief to address this concern.

BUSINESS OFFICE

Description

Programs, Functions, and Services

SUNY Cortland’s Business Office provides centralized financial services to the college community and serves
to execute formal institutional obligations to external vendors and clients through contracts and purchase orders as
well as payments and reimbursements to employees. In addition, all income identified as New York State revenue is processed through this office. The centralized structure, common at small colleges, satisfies the regulations of the State of New York, requiring financial control by formally designated college officers. Office objectives stress a strong service orientation to students, staff, and suppliers in addition to providing financial services that satisfy accepted business practices. The office ensures compliance with all internal and external policies, procedures, regulations, and laws. Overall, the Business Office strives to meet the highest standards of educational, administrative, and business ethics, reflecting the College's responsibilities to the community and to the public trust.

**History and Current Context**

Since Summer 2000 the Business Office has experienced a significant change in supervisory staff, welcoming a new associate vice president for finance (AVPF), director of student accounts, and budget officer. Dramatic growth in undergraduate enrollment over the last five years has generated a significant increase in demand for services from the student accounting area. Without adding staff, this area dealt with more financial aid packages, cut more refund checks, created more bills, handled more payments, and answered more phone requests in 2000-01 than ever before. Further, conversion to the new student information system BANNER 2000 during the last two years created problems for the College's staff and students. Added to the steep learning curve any time a new software system is installed, the Business Office underwent inadequate training and experienced poor leadership from within student accounting during the BANNER 2000 implementation. New leadership is now in place in that unit.

All areas in the unit have been affected by the evolution of web-based processes. Departments across campus can now access their accounts on-line, view detailed transactions, and receive real-time accounting information. In the College's accounts payable area, the implementation of QuickPay Voucher processing has resulted in more rapid turnaround time for payments to vendors and reimbursements to employees. In November 1998 the college payroll area switched to Pacer, which required a one-year adjustment period. The College anticipates a similar adjustment with its Research Foundation activities, which moved to an Oracle-based system in January 2001.

**Assessment Activities**

For the Business Office the formal modes of assessment consist of the external audits conducted by the Office of the State Comptroller (OSC) and the University Controller. Functionally, these audits provide feedback to the Business Office regarding compliance with state laws and procedures. Internally, the Business Office has a well-defined assessment plan in place, with each department having specific objectives, measures and criteria. In
addition, the Business Office has administered surveys to students regarding the student accounting operation and to college department heads for the office’s other functions.

Resources

Human. The Business Office is staffed by 26 professional and support staff members in seven separate departments, as shown in Table 5. The AVPF, a management/confidential employee, heads this office with the direct support of a secretary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Budgeting</th>
<th>Accounting</th>
<th>Student Accounting</th>
<th>Purchasing</th>
<th>Accounts Payable</th>
<th>Payroll</th>
<th>Research Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fiscal. All operations in the Business Office have sufficient budgets to operate effectively, and the office is also able to hire temporary service help as needed. Twenty-two of the office’s employees are supported by the state operation budget. The remaining six staff are supported by IFR funds generated through the College's tuition time payment plan and the administrative overhead charged to all IFR accounts.

Physical. All general equipment in the office is replaced as needed, and resources are sufficient to upgrade all computer equipment every four to five years. Space renovations were completed in Summer 2001 resulting in a better overall work environment for employees, and each of the seven individuals overseeing units in the Business Office is housed in a private office. If resources became available to add additional positions in order to accommodate enrollment growth, however, there would not be adequate office space to house them. The final phase of the renovation will move the director of student accounting much closer to the counter area to provide support for staff who interact with students.

Analysis

Congruence Between College Mission and Program Goals

The Business Office's performance directly supports the College’s mission and goals. While not always obvious, the unit’s vigilant and continuous emphasis upon compliance with both internal and external guidelines,
procedures, regulations, and laws protects the institution from violations and deviations. Each operation in the Business Office has clear goals and functions. For example, the timely and accurate disposition of paychecks provides payroll with accurate feedback that it is achieving its goal. In accounts payable, one goal is to comply with the New York State Prompt Payment Legislation, which is measured by late payment penalties and the number of days taken to process payments. By law, the maximum number of days for payment processing time is 30 days. For the 2000-01 fiscal year, SUNY Cortland's average time was 17 days.

Assessment of Programs, Functions, and Services

The Business Office is audited by the OSC and the University Controller's office from SUNY System Administration. Audits are conducted on a very consistent basis, and in fact in 2000-01 the Business Office underwent three audits. The last audit from OSC noted control weaknesses in student accounting due to an inadequate separation of duties. Although the Business Office has implemented compensating controls as a result, it is not possible at present to completely separate duties due to a lack of personnel.

The College’s Operating Budget

A spreadsheet providing a summary of all funds available for educational and general operations at the College is found in Appendix F. This summary encompasses state operation revenues, monies provided through the College’s summer and winter sessions, and tuition and fee-based revenues. Student fees support technology, athletic operations, and health center operations at the College as well as many other smaller accounts.

Overall, the College's budget adequately supports its projected programs and services. However, as shown below in Figure 10, the proportion of revenue generated from tuition has significantly increased over the last ten years. Conversely, the increase in state appropriations and fringe benefit support has increased less than $2.2 million in the last ten years. With no tuition increase since the Fall 1995, all increases in tuition revenue since then have been generated through enrollment increases. In order to support ongoing operations, SUNY Cortland has increased student fees by almost 79% since 1996-97. While the College has the flexibility to move state-supported positions over to IFR accounts, it then has to absorb the fringe benefit costs, which will exceed 31% in 2001-02. The state legislature also recently imposed restrictions on the extent to which student fees may be assessed, an action that will have serious repercussions for the College's ability to run its programs.
Figure 10

Proportion of Appropriation Covered by Tuition Revenue Vs. Tax Dollars, 1990-91 Through 2000-01

A summary report of all funds analyzing other than personal service (OTPS) allocation as a percentage of the College's total available funds to support educational programs is included in Figure 11. Although this figure remains around 10% over the last five years in proportion to the total state operational budget minus utilities, from an all-funds analysis this percentage is over 20%, excluding utilities, as seen in the chart in Appendix F. It should also be noted that tuition overflow revenue, which was $1.2 million for the 1999-00 fiscal year, can be used for OTPS expenditures, and for this fiscal year approximately $470,000 of this revenue was distributed for this purpose.

Figure 11

OTPS Allocation %, State Operations Vs. All-Funds Analysis, 1996 – 2001

Resources

As indicated above, the Business Office has been in a state of transition due to significant staff turnover, especially at management levels. All operations in the office depend heavily on having experienced, knowledgeable employees, in large part due to the complexity of the SUNY budgeting and accounting system, which has separate budget applications for stateside operations, IFR accounts, summer operating budgets, dormitory income fund
budgets, and Research Foundation activities. The Business Office runs a shadow budgeting system to provide requisite management information, meaning that data must be input twice, doubling the chance of errors. Although funding for equipment, operating budgets, and professional development and training programs are generally adequate, the Business Office is understaffed compared to other, same-size SUNY colleges. For example, student accounting at SUNY Oswego has sixteen full-time employees, with SUNY Cortland staffed by only nine. At SUNY Fredonia the budgeting operation is administered by two full-time professionals while the SUNY Cortland budget office has only one.

Although the budgeting and accounting processes would significantly improve in the Business Office if additional staffing resources were provided, President Taylor has identified increasing the number of full-time faculty positions as one of SUNY Cortland's three critical needs, and it is estimated that $800,000 will be required to reach optimal full-time faculty staffing levels. In addition, utility costs have risen over 30% in the last year, amounting to an increase of approximately $500,000. Both of these needs take precedence over hiring new personnel for the Business Office, unless additional funding can be identified.

**Relationship to Self-Study Special Emphasis Areas**

The Business Office has no ethnic minority employees at the present time, in large part because applicants for support staff positions tend to live within commuting distance and the surrounding community is predominately white. Student accounting frequently deals with students with disabilities who are sponsored by state and federal vocational rehabilitation programs, processing payment vouchers on these students’ behalf and maintaining contact with third party sponsors. In addition, SUNY has a goal of 3% for discretionary procurements through minority-owned business enterprises and 2% through women-owned business enterprises. Unfortunately, SUNY Cortland has not met these goals because of its location in an area that has few minority or women business enterprise (M/WBE) opportunities. The office has made attempts to solicit bids from M/WBE vendors through advertisements in the *Contract Reporter*, but in most cases the M/WBE responses have been comparatively more costly. In the area of technological advances, student accounting recently converted to the BANNER 2000 student accounting module, and in January 2001 the Research Foundation operation converted to an Oracle-based operating system. Both systems incorporate an integrated, state of the art information system, which include general ledger finance, accounts payable, and for Research Foundation activities, a payroll system.
Undoubtedly, Business Office operations are most affected by external conditions, especially those related to the New York State budgeting process. The annual prolonged delay in this process is a particular challenge to the College’s fiscal and operating responsibilities, and for the past seventeen years the state fiscal year has begun on April 1 without an approved budget. In contrast, the College’s planning process necessarily begins long before the onset of the budget year. While the College has sufficient resources to fund one-time needs, it is difficult to build ongoing expenses into a spending plan without knowing at the beginning of the fiscal year what funds will be available to support those costs. The World Trade Center disaster on September 11 has significant implications for the fiscal health of New York and will likely worsen an already bad situation for SUNY budgets.

FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

Description

**Brief History and Mission**

In July 1999 three offices – physical plant, environmental health and safety, and facilities planning and construction – merged under the auspices of a new unit, facilities management, headed up by an associate vice president (AVP FM). When residence life custodial services merged with the physical plant in Summer 2000, facilities management became one of the largest units on campus. The facilities management charge is to build, maintain, and promote a clean, attractive, safe, healthy, and productive environment that is a prime requirement for teaching and learning. Facilities management’s goal is to integrate the operations of its three units and provide comprehensive and uniform policies and procedures in order to enhance smooth and efficient operations. A primary focus has been to create a distinct identity for each unit while at the same time establishing unity and collaboration among the units. Toward this end, in October 1999 each unit conducted a retreat in order to develop a mission statement based on the College’s Mission Statement and discussed strategies for best fulfilling its mission.

**Programs, Functions, and Services**

Integration and collaboration program. A number of major initiatives have been developed to enhance service and promote integration among all three units. As one example, the purpose of the Work Control Center, which at one time only handled work orders, was changed and a new Customer Service Center within physical plant created to provide a central point of contact for the campus. This center serves multiple functions such as receiving and dispatching work orders, dispatching service calls, and coordinating shutdowns. In addition, a new computerized maintenance management system (TMA) was purchased in Fall 2000 to help coordinate these services.
Other examples involve the development of better means of communication, which include regular, monthly meetings between the assistant directors of the physical plant and facilities planning and construction and monthly meetings of all physical plant staff. In addition, in order to improve the quality of facilities and develop a uniform identity for the campus, a group of designated staff from physical plant and facilities planning and construction meet weekly and have developed the Facilities Design Standard. Other work groups have been established as needed, including the Event Setup Task Force, the Residence Hall Coordination Task Force, and the Move Coordination Task Force. Finally, in Spring 2000 facilities management published a service guide brochure and distributed it to the campus community. This brochure informs the community of recent organizational changes and makes the campus aware of facilities management’s functions, services, and contact information.

**Service and quality improvement program.** Several other steps have been taken in facilities management in an effort to improve quality and delivery of services, including the development of detailed policies and procedures for all units. Also, in order to enhance the efficiency of procurements and to reduce paperwork on small purchases, the state-advocated AMEX Procurements Card system was implemented in Spring 2000 with subsequent staff training. In Spring 1999, facilities planning and construction bid and awarded contracts to 13 contractors for a total of $860,000 for both Cortland and Raquette Lake sites. This program has provided a fast and effective way of contracting on smaller projects without requiring bidding each time. As a final example, in Fall 2000 the College’s one-route shuttle bus was replaced with a new, fee-generated transit system, an action that greatly alleviated the parking problem on the upper campus. In addition to providing seven day-a-week service with four main routes connecting the upper and lower campus as well as two remote sites, this new system included the development of a remote 400-space Park and Ride parking lot on the lower campus.

**Assessment**

As part of the College’s assessment program, every facilities management unit developed and implemented an assessment plan during the 2000-01 academic year, and all units have tools and programs in place for measuring and benchmarking operations. Additionally, in 1998 a consultant hired to assess physical plant effectiveness conducted a campus satisfaction survey, and the College’s Office of Institutional Research and Assessment continues to give this survey on an annual basis. Environmental health and safety conducted a similar survey in 1998.

Facilities management has also undergone two external audits recently. In Fall 1999 SUNY System Administration audited property control as part of a campus–wide audit. Based on the outcomes of this process, the
College created and filled a new property manager position, resulting in all inventories being updated and missing items recorded. As a proactive measure and due to the recent EPA audits of several colleges nationwide, facilities management hired a consultant in Fall 2000 to conduct an EPA self-audit. The findings and recommendations of this process led to the establishment of a Chemical Management Committee, construction of a new Chemical Management Facility, and integration of all emergency contingency plans.

Resources

**Human.** With over 170 permanent personnel, facilities management is the largest unit on campus and represents all campus bargaining units except for university police. Environmental health and safety has grown from one full-time and a part-time person to three full-time employees with backgrounds in chemical hygiene, fire safety, and ergonomics. In the winter of 2001, facilities planning and construction was restructured to have two assistant directors, one charged with planning and the other with construction. The current staff consists of project coordinators and site representatives from a variety of backgrounds, ranging from architecture and engineering to interior design. Around 87% of the staff have been with the office for less than four years. In physical plant about 40 staff members, or 25%, have retired in recent years, including the director. In addition to the property manager position, physical plant has added another professional position, a system administrator for the TMA system. These two positions coupled with the new director, who has a degree in mechanical engineering as well as an MBA, have brought a great deal of new expertise to the unit.

**Fiscal.** In 1998, the State University Construction Fund (SUCF) changed procedures for funding campus capital projects for campuses by implementing a new five-year capital plan for each institution. SUNY Cortland has been very active in utilizing this process, committing and expending in less than three years over 99% of its $41 million from the 1998-2003 plan. Table 6 shows project expenditures per year from fiscal year 1997 to 2001.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>1996/97-FY97</th>
<th>1997/98-FY98</th>
<th>1998/99-FY99</th>
<th>1999/00-FY00</th>
<th>2000/01-FY01</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement</td>
<td>5,350,000</td>
<td>2,220,000</td>
<td>3,468,000</td>
<td>11,750,000</td>
<td>13,764,000</td>
<td>36,552,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFR</td>
<td>273,000</td>
<td>1,219,000</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
<td>4,100,000</td>
<td>4,200,000</td>
<td>11,392,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Rehabilitation</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>366,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>254,000</td>
<td>254,000</td>
<td>1,214,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>5,050,000</td>
<td>157,000</td>
<td>6,314,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,725,000</td>
<td>4,755,000</td>
<td>5,463,000</td>
<td>21,154,000</td>
<td>18,375,000</td>
<td>55,472,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The College’s maintenance and operation budget has also risen significantly, from $743,000 in 1995 to $1,665,000 this past year, or 124%. The operation budget for environmental health and safety, however, is only $40,000, an amount that has not changed meaningfully since 1995. Since 1996, the College has spent over $70,000 in hazardous material disposal alone, and is currently considered a large-quantity generator. Within the next five years the College intends to reduce this expense by becoming a small-quantity generator.

Physical. With sites on the Cortland campus, at Raquette Lake and Brauer Geological Field Station, and at three off-campus locations in Cortland, the College has over 2.3 million square feet of facilities. From the early 1970’s until the late 1990’s, there was almost no significant construction. During the last five years, however, there has been a resurgence of both new construction and renovations on campus as well as at the off-campus sites, coupled with major changes in the physical plant. Many of these developments are described in Chapter 15 and include the following: The addition of 100,000 square feet to the College’s facilities, including a new stadium complex; replacement of 2,000 linear feet of campus steam lines and of all PCB transformers; resurfacing of 200,000 square feet of roads and parking areas; complete renovation of two residence halls and partial renovation of another; purchase of an apartment complex and conversion to a residence hall; construction of two new bus stop shelters; and, erection of two new monumental signs, directional signs, and building identification signs. A map of the main SUNY Cortland campus is found in Appendix G.

Analysis

Congruence Between College Mission and Program Goals

All facility management offices clearly understand the importance of their mission and work hard in order to satisfy constituents’ needs. The unit has taken advantage of the fact that its success and performance can be easily measured through surveys, which yield tangible and visible results. Further, the outcomes of its various programs, annual retreats, and multiple studies have provided data and enabled all units to review and monitor their mission, organizational structure, and strengths and weaknesses. Most important, all units have used these data to make appropriate changes that serve to improve the quality of their service.

Assessment of Programs, Functions, and Services

The ongoing and multiple assessments conducted across facilities management units consistently demonstrate that these units are meeting or exceeding target benchmarks they have established for themselves. Data from the three physical plant satisfaction surveys administered in 1998, 1999, and 2000 show that this unit receives ratings
above the midpoint of “3” in all areas, including mail delivery, transportation, custodial services, maintenance, grounds, and overall campus condition. Further, overall service ratings for 1998 and 1999 were 3.5, well exceeding the national norm of 2.99. Results for 2000 were inconsistent, however, with ratings for almost all individual services improving compared to 1999 but the overall rating decreasing significantly to 2.5. This result likely reflects higher expectations as well as respondents attributing construction-related disruption and inconvenience to physical plant. Nevertheless, results will be closely monitored in the 2001 survey administration. The satisfaction survey administered by environmental health and safety in 1998 revealed highly positive results, with overall quality of service receiving a mean rating of 4.27 out of 5.

Other examples of demonstrated effectiveness in facilities management include savings resulting from the energy management system, which was originally projected to save $4.7 million for 1997-2001 but actually produced $5.6 million in savings for that period. Similarly, the positive impact of the new transit system was evident in the first few days following implementation, with 570 parking permits for the new peripheral lot distributed when it was expected that only 320 would be issued. Further, transportation ratings on the physical plant satisfaction survey increased from 3.6 in 1999 to 3.76 in 2000.

Important evaluation information is also provided through the various audits that take place in facilities management. As one example, the findings of the 1999 property control audit have already been examined by the state, which found all deficiencies to be corrected and all conditions in compliance with guidelines. Similarly, although the EPA audit has not been completed for SUNY campuses to this point, the outcomes of SUNY Cortland’s self-audit have already generated benefits such as the construction of the new Chemical Management Facility and development of an integrated contingency plan.

Strengths, Weaknesses, and Problems

Facilities management’s strengths include an extremely well-qualified and dedicated staff, an assessment program in place that allows units to continuously monitor their progress toward objectives, and a demonstrated ability to manage multiple major projects both on- and off-campus efficiently and cost-effectively, while at the same time traversing an overly complicated and bureaucratic state construction fund system. In addition, facilities management has contributed significantly to the College’s stated commitment to promoting diversity and gender equity, especially through its hiring and promotion practices. The AVPFM is a female, and both she and the director of physical plant are members of underrepresented ethnic groups. In addition, at the present time women fill over
30% of the supervisory positions in physical plant, much higher than five years ago, and in 2000 facilities planning and construction hired a woman project coordinator for the first time and environmental health and safety added a female as a safety officer.

Many challenges currently facing facilities management exist because the College is a public entity. For example, it is difficult to deliver projects on time and within budget given restrictive public procurement procedures as well as a short time period in which to spend allocations. Working within the SUCF and Dormitory Authority of the State of New York procedures also impairs progress in a timely fashion. Further, SUNY has virtually no provisions for the disposal of surplus and damaged assets, meaning there is a significant accumulation of unusable equipment taking up valuable space on campus.

Other problems are more internal in nature, including the inevitable aftereffects of implementing significant organizational and personnel changes during 1999-2001. Specifically, while facilities management today benefits from a larger number of qualified staff, there are still personnel challenges. As one example, facilities planning and construction has experienced tremendous staff turnover the last few years, due largely to the location of Cortland and salary levels that cannot compete with those in private industry. Second, union agreements place great restrictions on physical plant in replacing classified positions with professional staff. Finally, state retirement incentive programs in 1999 and 2000 created a great gap in expertise in physical plant, producing a large number of entry-level staff members who require significant amount job training.

Resources also remain problematic. Although the maintenance budget has grown since 1995, it still needs to be increased substantially so as to sufficiently maintain the campus. This need derives from several factors, including the age and condition of maintenance equipment, the magnitude of deferred maintenance because of previous budget cuts, significant student enrollment growth, and the addition of new facilities and square footage growth.

Alternative Approaches

Although it is difficult to overcome obstacles resulting from public bidding limitations, facilities management has relied on methods such as fast-tracking, design-build, and construction manager approaches to address this problem, working closely with SUCF. Internally, the unit is considering the creation of a Minor Construction Team to manage in-house and smaller projects more effectively and efficiently. Environmental health and safety has developed several creative programs to overcome staff shortages, including developing student internships and providing training services to nearby campuses in exchange for assistance in collecting chemical waste. Similarly,
physical plant has utilized cross-training programs to assign bus drivers in the summer to assist with the Grounds Department. Finally, facilities management has begun submitting grant proposals to supplement funding shortages in the areas of construction, training, maintenance, and the historic preservation of the College's Raquette Lake properties.

Recommendations

In order to help the College continue to offer high quality programs and services within the Finance and Management area, the following actions are recommended:

1. Continue to critically analyze current resource usage focusing on student fees, the technology fee and budget, budgets for hiring adjunct faculty, and department/unit budgets.

2. Create a task force to examine planning procedures for developing staffing needs at the College along with a more automated process for handling the hiring of new faculty and staff.

3. Charge the Child Care Center Board of Directors to assess student child care needs, including those for non-traditional students, and if space demands warrant, form a task force to examine other possible sites to resolve space and operational issues for the center.

4. Form a task force to compare the results of the analysis of current space on campus with a common space standard and to develop a long-term space allocation plan.

5. Form a joint committee from finance and management and academic affairs to make recommendations on possible off-site programs and locations.

6. Monitor new budgeting processes closely and continue to provide mechanisms for more campus input.

7. Work closely with the Facilities Office to complete renovations in the student accounting area in order to improve efficiency and professional appearance.

8. Continue to meet with colleagues from other SUNY institutions to strengthen the Business Office’s network and build long-term relationships with other campuses, and provide frequent communication with SUNY System Administration in order to close the experience gap for newer employees in the office.

9. Create a task force to include representatives from human resources and all units within the Business Office to develop user-friendly manuals for training new employees.

10. Analyze the operations of the Business Office and develop and fund a reorganizational plan that would allow the gradual addition of new positions in key areas, coupled with the development of a retention plan to better assure continuity of staff.

11. Develop and fund a plan to provide more resources for facilities management in order to create a second shift for physical plant, increase budgets in physical plant and environmental health and safety by 25%, and to support capital improvement projects that address critical maintenance items.

12. Develop a comprehensive and integrated policy and procedure manual for all three units in facilities management.

13. Convert the academic building records on CAD by Summer 2002 in order to fully utilize and assess the effectiveness of the TMA system, at least for physical plant.
14. Continue to monitor the effectiveness of modifications made to communication programs both internal to facilities management and external with the campus community in order to maximize service and report project status.

15. Analyze post-project evaluations and develop goals to enhance project delivery.

16. Develop a facilities management personnel plan to address issues within the unit such as high turnover, new staff training, salaries, and salary inequity.

17. Continue to pursue projects like the Minor Construction Team and labor term contracts, which help save time and money on small projects without sacrificing quality.

18. Develop an environmental management plan to help reduce the high cost of hazardous waste disposal.
CHAPTER 9

Description

Introduction

Few areas at SUNY Cortland have changed as dramatically since the 1992 Middle States reaccreditation review as those of planning and assessment, with the College having made extensive progress incorporating these processes into virtually all areas of functioning. At present the College is in a time of real transition, poised to transform itself from an institution that engaged continuously in internal self-study processes that led to few tangible changes to one that embraces and is guided by a proactive philosophy of outcomes-based planning, assessment, and improvement.

Planning History and Background

SUNY Cortland has practiced formal institutional planning since 1980 when it began to participate in the SUNY-wide five-year planning process known as the Multiphase Rolling Plan. While some form or other of this process continued through the mid-1990’s, critics observed that few concrete revisions resulted from these efforts because there were too many goals that were not prioritized by the institution, because planning was not linked to funding, and because of inadequate follow-up activity. In addition, these planning efforts had no specific assessment component. In 1992, Middle States was very critical of the College’s planning and assessment efforts, saying the College was “in danger of being ‘frozen in place’ due to its vacillation regarding the planning process.” The external review report stated further that “assessment was the exception rather than the rule” at the College, and that there was a lack of strong institutional understanding of assessment and commitment to it. On the basis of this review, SUNY Cortland was required to file follow-up reports on these areas for the next three years.

In response to the criticism by Middle States, SUNY Cortland established the College Assessment Committee in 1993 and charged it to provide direction with respect to outcomes assessment and to develop plans and activities that would create an institution-wide understanding of assessment. Still, efforts in planning and assessment continued separately until 1995, when President Taylor assumed office. As detailed in the College’s 1997 Periodic Review Report to Middle States, one of President Taylor’s first actions was to initiate a campus-wide Review and Restructuring Process (RRP), which required all college units to submit summaries of their programs and services, followed by public hearings and, ultimately, some significant restructuring and reallocation of resources. In addition, the president introduced a new form of strategic planning that was explicitly assessment-based, with a
small number of priority goals identified and action plans developed for each goal that specifically designated performance indicators to be used in determining success in goal achievement. To date, two planning rounds have been carried out using this approach, with results documented in the 1996 Long Range Planning Report, which was prepared and distributed in May 1997, and the 1998-99 Long Range Planning Report, filed in January 2000. A third planning round, described in more detail below, is currently underway and scheduled for completion in Spring 2002. Appendix H contains a complete listing of planning goals for the three long range planning rounds.

As another important development, during 1996-97 the College Assessment Committee established guidelines for academic departments to follow in establishing and implementing assessment plans. These guidelines required departments to take into consideration the College Mission Statement and other college priorities in developing their own objectives, thereby providing another mechanism for linking planning and assessment as well as for linking planning across different organizational levels of the institution.

**College Mission**

The foundation of the College, and the subsequent central component of all planning and assessment initiatives, is its Mission Statement. In 1995 President Taylor received a memo from faculty members suggesting the College’s 1984 Mission Statement be revised to better reflect the institution. Further impetus resulted when SUNY System Administration initiated its university-wide mission review process in 1996-97. The task of reviewing and modifying the College’s Mission Statement fell to the Faculty Senate’s Educational Policy Committee (EPC). Following a process of open forums, inviting and receiving input from the campus community, and further revision by EPC, the Faculty Senate recommended the revised statement to President Taylor, who approved it in April 1998.

Emphases in the new Mission Statement included making it uniquely identifiable to SUNY Cortland, defining concrete outcomes for SUNY Cortland students, featuring the arts and sciences programs as well as building on the College’s strengths in professional studies, recognizing graduate programs to a greater extent, and incorporating technology and evaluation of its impact on teaching and learning. In addition to restating the basic values and goals of the College, the new Mission Statement, found in Appendix B, provides a more explicit and marketable image for potential students and faculty in a time of teacher shortages and high technology demands.

**The Structure of Planning and Assessment at SUNY Cortland**

While mechanisms for linking planning and assessment clearly exist at the College, there is no structural body that explicitly integrates these functions across campus. Instead, institutional planning is governed by specific
procedures approved by the Faculty Senate and administration, and takes place largely through the Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC), a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, working in conjunction with the President’s Council. Together, these two groups work to identify priority goals for a given planning round and to provide leadership in developing action plans and implementing these plans. At the beginning of a planning round, the College solicits individuals from across campus to participate in working groups co-chaired by an LRPC member and President’s Council representative. These working groups develop detailed action plans for meeting each goal, which are then reviewed and approved by the Faculty Senate and the President’s Cabinet. Although these action plans project out through the next two to three years, they also contain a detailed time schedule for carrying out specific actions for each year, thereby serving to link longer-term institutional planning with shorter-term implementation strategies. Appendix I contains a sample action planning sheet used in the planning process.

In January 1999 the President’s Cabinet took a monumental step, endorsing the principle that requests for new monies should be related to long range planning goals, representing the first time budgeting was specifically tied to long range planning. Other changes in the long range planning process took place in November 2000, based on recommendations by the LRPC and approval by the Faculty Senate and President Taylor. These changes included extending the implementation period from two to three years to allow greater flexibility in achieving the action plans and adding campus-wide review and accountability steps to the process.

To this point, the College Assessment Committee (CAC) has initiated most major actions related to assessment, at the president’s request and with the support of the provost and other vice presidents. The CAC consists largely of faculty but also includes the provost, the executive assistant to the president, the two deans, and professional staff members representing student affairs, finance and management, and institutional advancement. Another significant addition to the College’s assessment structure took place in 1998 when administrative reorganization led to the creation of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA). A director to oversee this unit was hired in January 1999, and one full-time professional staff and one full-time clerical staff position provide support. The major activities of the CAC and OIRA are described in some detail below.

It is also important to note that the goal “To implement the college-wide assessment plan” has been a priority goal in the College’s last two planning rounds. For the 2000-02 round, the following activities were included in the action plan for this goal: Development of a college-wide assessment philosophy and of a resolution on assessment to be endorsed by the Faculty Senate, production of an assessment pamphlet to be distributed to students, planning and
holding an assessment forum with other area colleges invited to attend, development of an institutional assessment measure to administer to students, development of incentive programs to help departments advance their assessment plans, and providing travel funds to faculty and staff to attend assessment conferences. The President’s Cabinet allocated $22,500 to the CAC to spend on these activities for the 2001-02 academic year.

Analysis

Evaluation of College Mission and Goals Using Middle States Standards

An evaluation of the College’s mission and goals conducted by a joint committee of the LRPC and the EPC for the self-study indicates that they are quite compatible with the high standards put forth in the Commission on Higher Education’s *Characteristics of Excellence*. In particular, specific phrases exist in the College’s Mission Statement that correspond to each of the nine criteria identified by the Commission as defining an institution’s mission and goals. For instance, with respect to the Commission’s criterion of developing student character, the College states its intention to have students "acquire fundamental life skills and values" and to develop into "independent learners living enriched lives.” Another criterion specified by the Commission is fostering commitment to ethical, social, and intellectual values. As asserted in the College’s Mission Statement: “We focus on helping students become good citizens with a strong social conscience and an appreciation of the environment and diverse intellectual and cultural heritages.” A complete analysis of the other seven criteria can be found in the Middle States office.

The College’s planning goals and objectives also appear to meet six standards established in the *Characteristics*. Specifically, these goals and objectives identify the institution and are expressed in simple terms, honest, stated in terms of results, attainable, and understood and utilized within the institution. Further, the structure of the planning process itself corresponds to Commission guidelines, with faculty and professional staff members working closely with campus administrators to develop clearly stated, realistic goals and objectives that identify highly specific indicators of success and designate persons or groups responsible for their attainment.

Congruence Between Mission and Goals

As determined by the LRPC/EPC joint committee, the College’s long range planning goals are generally congruent with the College Mission Statement. The institution has also been reasonably successful in achieving many of the proposed actions included for its planning goals. It is true, however, that SUNY Cortland has implemented some planning goals more successfully than others. To illustrate, for the last planning round almost all actions intended to help “improve and expand outreach and partnerships” were achieved, while less progress was
made in efforts to “provide learning, programming, and social opportunities leading to an improved understanding of diversity.” Partially as a result, when priority goals were being established for 2000-02, the outreach objective was eliminated and the diversity objective included once more, though in a revised form. It is important to note, however, that continuation of a goal from one planning round to the next does not necessarily mean the College has failed in that area. It may simply mean that the goal remains an institutional priority. A good example is the College’s technology goal, which for 1998-99 focused on the development of a campus technology infrastructure but was revised for 2000-02 to stress ways of providing services and resources that depend on that infrastructure.

**Major Accomplishments in Planning and Assessment**

As stated earlier, three long range planning rounds have been undertaken since President Taylor’s arrival, with the last round completed in 1999 and a full report filed in January 2000. While the *1998-99 Long Range Planning Report* provides a detailed summary of all actions planned and accomplished for that round, it should be noted here that remarkable progress was made in this planning phase, with 112/159 (70%) planned actions either completed or still in progress at the time of the report. Following the College’s planning procedures, the President’s Council and LRPC reviewed this report, consulted with constituents, and proposed a set of eight priority goals for the next planning round, to run from 2000-02. Further, in February 2001 the President’s Cabinet, honoring its commitment to fund the long range planning process, allocated a total of $171,900 to implement the eight priority goals through Spring 2002. Another measure of success is the extent to which members of the campus community volunteer to serve on the work groups that develop the action plans for each goal. For the planning round completed in 1999, more than 60 faculty and professional staff members participated, with more than 70 taking part in developing the action plans for 2000-02. To date, the College has not solicited student participation in long range planning.

Advances in assessment have been equally impressive. In Spring 1996 the CAC produced thorough guidelines for academic programs to follow in developing and implementing an assessment plan. This four-step model, based generally on Middle States guidelines contained in *Framework for Outcomes Assessment*, began with faculty identifying and agreeing about their programmatic goals, with the second step consisting of the identification of specific programmatic activities that make goal achievement possible. For step three, departments were asked to indicate what methods it would use to measure how effectively it is achieving its goals, and to create a time line for implementation and designate responsibility for carrying out the plan. For the fourth step, departments described how they would use assessment results to revise their programs, if appropriate.
In their assessment plans academic programs were required to emphasize concrete data and measures and to include student learning outcomes in their assessment strategies. Considerable leeway was afforded, however, in programs’ choice of specific strategies and measures. Popular instruments selected by programs included portfolios, senior seminar projects, student performances, and pre- and post-testing, as well as discipline-specific content tests. In many instances, these measures were course-embedded, although some programs chose to conduct assessments outside courses. In other words, this process was designed to give departments maximum flexibility and autonomy in determining their own goals and assessment strategies, while at the same time building some uniformity into the process. For example, the guidelines stipulated that departments should reflect the College Mission Statement in their own statement of objectives as well as the All-College Student Learning Goal, which the CAC developed and the Faculty Senate endorsed in April 1996. This goal is stated as follows: “A major expectation for all SUNY Cortland students at the point of graduation is that they possess the skills necessary to gather relevant information, evaluate it critically, and communicate it effectively to an audience in written and oral forms.”

During 1996-97 academic programs developed and submitted assessment plans that were critiqued by the CAC, after which the provost and deans assumed responsibility for overseeing plan implementation. A time line was also established, with the intention that all programs would complete at least one round of assessment prior to submission of the institutional self-study to Middle States in Spring 2002. In 1998-99 the CAC produced guidelines for support and service units to follow in developing assessment plans, analogous to those for academic departments and programs. These units submitted a plan during Spring 2000 for review by the CAC, and vice presidents assumed responsibility for ensuring units under their purview implemented the plan during the 2000-01 academic year.

As a result of this activity, as of Fall 2000 virtually all units, including administrative offices, had operational assessment plans in place. In order to enhance accountability, the President’s Cabinet informed units they would be required to present the major outcomes of their assessment plan, and academic departments started making presentations in Spring 2001. Members of the President’s Council attended these presentations, which were open to the campus community, with the President’s Cabinet and two academic deans evaluating the presentations. This feedback was compiled into a written summary that was sent to the departments by President Taylor. In addition, on the basis of the quality of a department’s assessment plan and presentation, the President’s Cabinet and deans reached one of the following three judgments: 1) the department had done at least an adequate job, thereby satisfying the requirements of the first assessment round; 2) the department had done a reasonable job but needed to
file a follow-up report because of one or more weaknesses; or, 3) the department had significant problems with its assessment program, and therefore needed to make another presentation. A similar process was followed for support and service units and administrative offices, which began making presentations in Summer 2001, except that only President’s Cabinet members evaluated these units. Also, since as described in Chapter 14 SUNY’s funding formula, PBBA, now takes into account an institution’s scores on the Student Opinion Survey (SOS), support and service units were required to utilize appropriate SOS items as performance indicators in their assessment plan.

Through December 2001, 24 academic departments and 39 support and service units made assessment presentations, with one new academic department and two support and service units scheduled to present in Spring 2002. Table 7 summarizes the outcomes of the evaluations academic departments and support and service units received in response to their presentations. As one criterion for the presentations, units described specific outcomes resulting from their assessment program (to include student learning outcomes when appropriate) as well as programmatic changes that had been made based on assessment findings. These presentations demonstrated clearly that units were using assessment data to improve their programs. With respect to academic programs, for example, departments described changes they had made in course requirements for majors, approaches to teaching writing, textbook selection, and advisement for majors, among many others. Similarly, support and service units reported numerous modifications in programs and services, such as adding extended office hours, administering satisfaction surveys to various constituent groups, providing training and educational workshops specific to constituents’ needs, and developing new strategies to enable users to make contact with their offices (e.g., through the college website). A complete set of assessment materials for academic programs and support and service units, including assessment plans, presentation materials, and evaluations is available in the Middle States Office.

Table 7

Outcomes for Academic Programs and Support and Service Units’ Assessment Presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Satisfactory Progress</th>
<th>Follow-up Report Required</th>
<th>Follow-up Presentation Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Departments</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and Service Units and Administrative Offices</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers represent outcomes of original presentations. In Fall 2001 two academic departments and three support and service units made a second presentation and were found to be satisfactory, leaving three academic departments to make a follow-up presentation in Spring 2002.
Some final activities of the CAC include work it accomplished as part of the long range planning goal on assessment described above. Specifically, in Spring 2001 this group developed a college-wide philosophy of assessment that it then took to the College’s Faculty Senate for consideration and endorsement. The Senate endorsed this philosophy unanimously in March 2001, and it was published in the 2001-02 College Catalog. This philosophy is also included in a pamphlet on outcomes assessment designed by the CAC in Fall 2001 and to be distributed to incoming students effective Spring 2002. In May 2001 the CAC developed a resolution on assessment that was considered and passed overwhelmingly by the Faculty Senate, an action that clearly demonstrated buy-in for outcomes assessment on the part of faculty. Finally, in Fall 2001 the CAC developed guidelines for two incentive grant programs, one to send interested faculty and staff members to an assessment conference of their choice during Spring 2002 and a second to provide up to $1,000 to academic programs so the programs can advance their existing assessment plans.

Resources and Support for Assessment

A key source of support for outcomes assessment at SUNY Cortland comes directly from presidential leadership and backing from other top-level administrators. In the 1998-99 Long Range Planning Report, President Taylor made two statements that established a vision for planning as it relates to assessment, stating that “Goals are only useful to an institution if they lead to an action followed by evaluation and, finally, to the reformation of new goals,” and “Responsible institutional planning requires careful evaluation of programs’ contributions, success and prospects, and it must link that evaluation to specific budget actions.” President Taylor used the College’s Opening Meeting in August 1998 as an opportunity to announce his intentions to emphasize the theme “Building a Culture of Improvement,” to which all units of the College would be expected to contribute. Clearly, the assessment plan process is an integral part of this effort. In addition, this emphasis led to the formation of more than a dozen quality teams focusing on tasks such as reducing paper use, improving the voice mail system, curbing excessive e-mail use, and streamlining processes governing travel authorization and approving new faculty and staff lines. The administration’s support of and commitment to outcomes assessment is also demonstrated through the assessment presentation process described earlier, with the presence of top-level administrators at these evaluative sessions obviously sending a powerful signal to the institution that assessment is a serious enterprise.

Reflecting these emphases, SUNY Cortland has invested significant resources into outcomes assessment. In its 1997 Periodic Review Report to Middle States, the College reported on its involvement in a nationwide
benchmarking study, “Measuring Institutional Performance Outcomes,” conducted by the American Quality and Productivity Corporation (AQPC) in Houston, just beginning at that time. After taking part in this study, the College also participated in a second benchmarking study conducted by APQC, entitled “Assessing Learning Outcomes.” Although SUNY System Administration paid most of the substantial participation fees, the College absorbed all travel costs, which not only included numerous trips to Houston for faculty and administrators, but also travel for faculty associated with visits to “best practice” institutions like Truman State University, Ball State University, Emporia State University, the University of Phoenix, and Indiana University Purdue University at Indianapolis. Involvement in these projects proved to be extremely important in educating administrators and faculty alike about outcomes assessment, and also provided SUNY Cortland the opportunity to become part of a national network of colleges, universities, and corporations that participated in the benchmarking studies as well as to play a leadership role in SUNY-wide assessment, as described below.

Other examples of support for assessment have included bringing outside consultants to campus to talk about assessment, including Dr. Donald Farmer from Kings College and Dr. Candace Young from Truman State University, and in 1998 the provost’s office funded a small incentive grant program to departments requesting money to advance their assessment plans. In addition, shortly after developing the guidelines for assessment plans, the CAC compiled a comprehensive resource manual that included prototype assessment plans from other institutions for virtually all academic majors at the College and distributed this manual to all academic programs to use as an aid in the development of their own plans. In a highly significant gesture, in Fall 2000 President Taylor for the first time tied faculty and staff involvement in assessment to the College’s annual Discretionary Salary Increase (DSI) process, explicitly stating that such involvement would receive special weight in DSI decisions.

SUNY Cortland’s most significant investment in outcomes assessment is perhaps best exemplified by its decision to reorganize several administrative units in 1998, thereby creating an Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) out of what was formerly Institutional Research. This unit continues to serve as the College’s major information contact with SUNY System Administration, and must therefore respond to numerous data requests from SUNY. In its new configuration, however, it also provides support and service to academic programs and other units as they develop and implement their own assessment programs. The director of institutional research and assessment (DIRA) reports directly to the provost and serves as a member of the CAC.
The contributions of OIRA to the College in just three years of existence have been impressive, to say the least. In addition to offering general assessment support to all units, this office provides survey design, administration, and analysis services, produces enrollment, graduation, and retention reports for academic programs, conducts assessment training workshops for departments and units, and disseminates information received from System Administration to the campus in an effective fashion. For instance, OIRA has played an instrumental role in receiving and distributing comparative results from the SUNY-administered Student Opinion Survey (SOS) to appropriate persons and offices. OIRA has also produced a variety of reports, including the following: Results of a survey of students who completed the English Department’s Composition Program, a reliability and validity study of the English Department’s Portfolio Assessment Program, and findings from a questionnaire administered to head coaches assessing their perceptions of gender equity in the College’s athletics program. Many of the reports prepared by OIRA can be found on its website, http://www.cortland.edu/oir/.

In addition, OIRA regularly publishes an assessment newsletter entitled Improvement Matters, which provides the campus with assessment-related information as well as updates on progress across the College in this arena. During 1999-2000 this office provided leadership in researching various assessment software packages that will enable the College and individual units to better organize and monitor their assessment programs. Ultimately, the College purchased TracDat for this purpose. TracDat is a text-based assessment tool that allows users to input programmatic objectives, relate those objectives to institutional or school mission, identify assessment measures and criteria for evaluating objectives, keeping track of individual student performance on various measures, and analyze student performance as a group. As of November 2001, 14 academic departments and 5 support and service units were using TracDat, at a total cost to the College of around $7,000. A particularly salient contribution of OIRA is evidenced in the progress that has taken place in the General Education Committee’s assessment of the College’s General Education Program, utilizing student learning outcomes. This effort is described in Chapter 3.

Comparing Assessment at SUNY Cortland to Middle States Standards and Other Institutions

A review of the guiding principles for college assessment included in the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s Frameworks for Outcomes Assessment indicates that SUNY Cortland’s assessment program is closely aligned with these principles. First, while academic programs do focus on student learning outcomes in their assessment plans, most also include other measures including course teacher evaluations, alumni perceptions of program quality, and exit interviews with graduating students to determine their satisfaction with different aspects of
the program. Second, as documented above, the College has invested significant resources into supporting program assessment, enhancing the probability that these efforts will be successful and lead to improvements. Third, many academic departments and support and service units request and receive from institutional research and assessment existing data and reports (e.g., retention and graduation statistics by department, SOS results), thereby maximizing the use of information that has already been collected. Similarly, most units have developed and implemented their assessment plans in a “program-embedded” fashion, meaning that for the most part they have collected data in the context of activities that would have taken place anyway, thereby increasing the probability that their assessment programs are “yielding dividends that justify the institution’s investment.” A fifth assessment criterion detailed in Frameworks is not met, in that SUNY Cortland is not yet to the point where it has systematically conducted research on the impact of assessment practices on its students, curriculum, and academic and public policy. Such activity might be possible with the continuing advancement and maturation of the College’s assessment program.

With respect to its standing relative to other comparable colleges in the area of assessment, SUNY Cortland did play a leadership role in organizing SUNY involvement in the APQC benchmarking projects described above, successfully requesting funding from System Administration to pay the hefty registration fees and coordinating the participation of three other SUNY institutions: Fashion Institute of Technology, Tompkins Cortland Community College, and Empire State College. Largely on the basis of this activity, in 1999 the SUNY Provost’s Office consulted with SUNY Cortland as it explored the best ways of developing and implementing a SUNY-wide assessment initiative. Eventually, the SUNY Provost asked the College’s executive assistant to the president to co-chair the Provost’s Advisory Task Force on the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes, which produced a report in November 2000 making recommendations regarding the assessment of general education and academic majors across SUNY’s 64 campuses. These recommendations, detailed in Chapter 14, included the establishment of another SUNY-wide committee, the General Education Assessment Review (GEAR) group, which would serve to oversee campus-based assessment of general education programs across SUNY. SUNY Cortland’s executive assistant to the president co-chairs the GEAR group, and the College maintains the group’s website, at www.cortland.edu/ori/gear. It is also notable that the SUNY-wide guidelines for assessing general education and academic majors are based directly on SUNY Cortland’s four-step approach to assessing academic programs.

While it is clear that SUNY Cortland’s assessment program has had a pervasive impact on SUNY-wide assessment, it is difficult to say how the College’s program compares to those at other SUNY schools, largely
because there is no mechanism across SUNY for reviewing institutional assessment plans. The DIRA queried his SUNY counterparts and received only one response, while inquiries by the College’s vice president of finance and management of her counterparts resulted in only the anecdotal perception that SUNY Cortland is ahead of the other SUNY four-year colleges. Information obtained from GEAR group members suggests that SUNY Cortland is one of a few SUNY institutions to have completed three outcomes-based evaluations of general education and is likely the only institution to have almost completed one round of assessment of academic majors using the assessment presentation format described earlier as an accountability measure. Finally, no other SUNY institution has evaluated its support and service units using the rigorous procedures utilized at SUNY Cortland.

Future Challenges

Despite the remarkable progress that has taken place in the areas of planning and assessment since the mid-1990’s, problems remain, one which relates directly to planning. As noted by the LRPC/EPC joint committee that evaluated SUNY Cortland’s mission and planning efforts for the self-study, there are discrepancies and even conflicting objectives included in the College’s major planning documents. To illustrate, the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with System Administration clearly states the College’s intentions to meet NCATE accreditation and NYSED mandated requirements by 2003, yet these goals are not included in the College’s current long range planning document. Conversely, the College’s long range plan establishes an increase in ethnic minority faculty and students as a priority, but there is no mention of this objective in the MOU. In some cases the two planning documents actually conflict, such as when the MOU asserts it does not anticipate significant increases in non-traditional students despite the fact that attracting and retaining “both undergraduate and graduate adult learners” is one of eight priority goals in the 2000-02 long range plan.

To some extent these discrepancies reflect the different purposes of the MOU, which necessarily took into account expectations by System Administration, and the long range plan, developed entirely by and for internal stakeholders. Further, the College is clearly within its rights to establish priority goals it views as critical even if System Administration does not. Still, this lack of correspondence between two major planning documents results in ambiguity as to what the College’s operational goals actually are, and future planning efforts should strive to reconcile objectives of all major planning so there is no confusion about the College’s priorities.

As a second problem, there is an absence of an overall structure that links planning, assessment, and budgeting across all organizational levels of the College. For instance, while the administration did provide significant funding
in support of long range planning for 2000-02, this funding was allocated on a one-time basis, meaning that there remains no permanent source of funding for planning or assessment on an ongoing basis, either at the institutional or unit level.

Other challenges relate exclusively to assessment. As one example, SUNY Cortland has yet to institute a true assessment culture embraced by most faculty and staff members, with faculty resistance the major obstacle. As revealed by the Middle States questionnaires completed by department chairpersons, a primary factor inhibiting faculty morale is the College’s emphasis on assessment. Of course, virtually all colleges across the nation face the problem of trying to convince faculty members, especially at more senior levels, that outcomes assessment is a valuable activity. SUNY Cortland has taken several steps to address this problem, by giving assessment a prominent role in the institution, featuring “best practice” efforts across the College, and offering financial incentives to both programs and individuals for advancing assessment across campus. In addition, in an attempt to introduce junior faculty members to outcomes assessment and its importance, for the first time the provost included a session on outcomes assessment as a part of her orientation program for new faculty in August 2001.

Another challenge is unevenness across academic departments in the quality of their assessment plans, with departments varying widely in their knowledge of and interest in outcomes assessment. This conclusion is supported by differences in the outcomes of assessment presentations shown in Table 7. A positive observation is that, based on these presentations, several departments at SUNY Cortland have assessment programs in place that would stand as “best practice” at any institution across the country. Unfortunately, others are clearly inadequate and are unlikely to lead departments to meaningful program improvements. A possible remedy would be to make departments more aware of other programs’ assessment plans, especially those that are relatively advanced and could therefore be used as a model by other programs.

Problems also result from external pressures, and in particular new assessment-related requirements by SUNY System Administration mentioned above and detailed in Chapter 14. Fortunately, the advanced nature of SUNY Cortland’s assessment program should give it somewhat of an advantage in establishing outcomes-based assessment plans for general education and academic majors that will be acceptable to System Administration. More problematic is the renewed emphasis by SUNY on program review standards, which have technically existed for many years but have not been enforced for quite some time. These standards call for much more comprehensive procedures than are needed in developing assessment plans, and will require SUNY Cortland to significantly
strengthen and restructure its approach to evaluating academic programs. As a final observation, these assessment-related challenges became daunting in December 2001 when the College’s DIRA decided to leave SUNY Cortland to accept a faculty position at another institution. A search to fill this position is already underway.

Summary and Recommendations

This chapter demonstrates that SUNY Cortland has made great strides in transforming itself into an institution that is driven by planning and assessment. Five major strengths in these areas are readily apparent, including strong leadership from the administration in emphasizing these processes as vital to the health of the institution and providing resources to support them. In addition, planning and assessment have been integrated, with a strong assessment component added to long range planning and the incorporation of institutional mission and objectives into assessment programs. Specifically with respect to assessment, the College elected to utilize an institution-wide process that is standardized yet allows units to establish their own objectives and assessment measures and strategies. The College also successfully ties assessment initiatives and planning to the college mission. Finally, in introducing most new assessment initiatives, the College has worked collaboratively with and sought the endorsement of the Faculty Senate, thereby making every effort to maximize faculty buy-in.

Based on this evaluation, the following actions are recommended with respect to future planning and assessment efforts at the College:

1. Create explicit and publicly acknowledged linkages among budgeting, planning, and assessment processes.
2. Identify ongoing, stable funding source for long range planning process and for assessment.
3. Incorporate academic program assessment planning process into System Administration’s program review process.
4. Maintain annual assessment planning and implementation process for support and service units.
5. Assess faculty attitudes toward assessment and develop strategies based on results for responding to any concerns that emerge.
6. Develop and implement assessment of institutional goals for student learning, perhaps in conjunction with efforts to meet System Administration’s requirements for general education assessment.
7. Attempt to involve students more actively in both long range planning and outcomes assessment.
8. Ensure in the future that planning documents prepared for different purposes reflect the same major institutional priorities to the greatest extent possible.
EQUITY, ACCESS AND DIVERSITY

CHAPTER 10

Description

Introduction

In the 1992 institutional self-study for Middle States, the Equity and Access Work Group concluded that, despite having an “obvious spoken and written commitment to diversity, equity, and access,” the College had yet to “go beyond the spoken and written commitment to create a community where non-mainstream students feel welcome and wanted.” Almost ten years later, Equity, Access and Diversity was selected as a special emphasis area for self-study, and the work group charged to explore this area analyzed college efforts to increase diversity and ensure access to all members of the campus community, with special emphasis on representatives of ethnic minority groups, women, people with disabilities, and gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. The work group was particularly interested in progress made since the last Middle States report, as assessed through a review of institutional mission, enrollment and hiring data, curriculum, admissions and retention practices, general campus climate for these groups, and relationships with the larger Cortland community.

Institutional Mission and Goals

The pursuit of equity, access, and diversity is certainly consistent with SUNY Cortland’s institutional mission as reflected in its Mission Statement, which states that the College is “dedicated to the affirmation and promotion of diversity in the broadest sense.” These objectives have also been included as priorities in the last three iterations of the College’s long range planning process (see Appendix H) and for the current planning round one of eight priority goals is to “increase the ethnic minority student and faculty populations and provide opportunities leading to an improved understanding of diversity.” In addition to being consistent with the College’s mission, these objectives are highly consonant with current and future educational and demographic realities, especially in a state as ethnically diverse as New York.

Student and Faculty Composition by Ethnic Minority Group and Gender

Undergraduate enrollment data from Fall 2001 show 118 (2%) African American, 174 (3%) Hispanic, 46 (0.8%) Asian or Pacific Islander, and 20 (0.3%) Native American undergraduate students out of a population of 5,887. Female students comprise 58.8% of the undergraduate student body. Table 8 summarizes undergraduate student numbers by gender and ethnic minority group for the past five years, and shows that the proportion of ethnic
minority students was essentially the same over this time, with some increase in female students. Across this same period, graduate programs had lower percentages of ethnic minority students (ranging from 1-2%, with an increase to 2.6% for Fall 2001) and a higher percentage of female students (67-70%) compared to undergraduate programs.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female Students</th>
<th>Male Students</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Eth. Min. Students</th>
<th>% Eth. Min. Students</th>
<th>% Fem. Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2805</td>
<td>2332</td>
<td>5137</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2984</td>
<td>2268</td>
<td>5252</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3202</td>
<td>2407</td>
<td>5609</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3281</td>
<td>2367</td>
<td>5648</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3462</td>
<td>2425</td>
<td>5887</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2000 the President’s Task Group on the Recruitment and Retention of Ethnic Minority Students compared Cortland’s percentage of ethnic minority students to other SUNY colleges and found that Cortland ranked 11 out of 12 university colleges for which these data were available. This group also found that SUNY Cortland ranked 11 out of 12 university colleges in terms of the percentage of ethnic minority faculty. They analyzed data from other SUNY colleges to examine the role that the low number of ethnic minority faculty and Cortland’s rural location might play in ethnic minority student enrollment. Although both of these factors were associated with low ethnic minority student enrollment at sister institutions, the relationships were far from perfect, meaning that Cortland’s rural location and lack of ethnic minority faculty can only partly explain the low number of ethnic minority students.

As shown in Table 9, SUNY Cortland employs somewhat higher percentages of ethnic minorities among faculty, professional staff, and management/confidential (M/C) employees than are represented in the student population, and women are very well-represented, in fact making up the majority of M/C and professional staff employees. Presidential leadership was underscored in the 1999-2000 academic year when President Taylor charged the Affirmative Action Committee to develop a comprehensive plan for increasing the number of ethnic minority faculty members, professional and classified staff, and administrators. Additionally, beginning in 1996 the president included affirmative action-related achievements as a criterion in all M/C employee performance programs and evaluations.
Table 9
Faculty and Staff Categorized by Ethnic Minority Group and Gender, Fall 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th># of Women (%)</th>
<th># of Ethnic Minority (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M/C</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14 (56%)</td>
<td>3 (8.33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>96 (38.9%)</td>
<td>30 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>79 (53.7%)</td>
<td>10 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College’s Affirmative Action Plan also includes hiring targets of women and ethnic minority members for academic departments. These goals are based on a percentage of targeted populations in the total qualified job pool. This report notes that twelve academic departments met their goals from the previous Affirmative Action Plan, and one department that had been meeting its targets was still doing so. Conversely, six departments did not meet their goals, and five departments that had previously met their targets were no longer doing so. These findings demonstrate improvements in recent years in some departments, as some departments lost ground. Overall, however, the College during the last five years has had phenomenal success hiring new full-time female faculty, with 70 of 128 hires (55%) women. In addition, while the number of ethnic minorities hired in full-time faculty positions stayed around 3-4% through 1999, for 2000-01 that percentage increased to 20% (5 out of 26 positions) staying at 19% for 2001-02 (4 out of 21 positions). Chapter 5 includes more information on hiring trends.

In contrast to the ethnic minority student population at SUNY Cortland, students with disabilities have increased exponentially over the past several years with a 32% increase during 2000-01 alone. Currently, there are 305 students identified as learning disabled, and admissions data suggest that 20% of applicants have identified themselves as such. Based on current requests for services, it is almost impossible for the coordinator of student disability services to meet the demand, and students may have to wait three weeks to get a scheduled appointment during high-demand times. The number of students with physical disabilities is not as large, but has increased as well, and this group often has multiple needs that are difficult and time-consuming to accommodate. The College has spent nearly $4 million to enable physically disabled students to negotiate the campus. There remain, however, areas that are inaccessible for students in wheelchairs, including the Office of the Dean of Professional Studies.

Campus Programs and Services

Center for Multicultural and Gender Studies. The organization with the broadest charter related to issues of diversity at SUNY Cortland is the Center for Multicultural and Gender Studies (CMGS), which until Fall 2001
reported to the dean of arts and sciences but now reports directly to the provost. The CMGS attempts to serve the needs of underrepresented groups by offering relevant curriculum programs and programming and providing support services as necessary. A number of sub-committees make up the CMGS, many of which oversee the curriculum programs described below. Two additional committees are the Student Support Committee and the Lesbian and Gay Concerns Committee, which focus on campus climate issues related to underrepresented students.

Curriculum. The CMGS offers one major, five minors and four concentrations in multicultural-related disciplines, and an additional minor will begin in 2002. For the most part, courses that fulfill these programs are co-listed with courses in other departments and are taught by personnel from those departments, as no full-time faculty lines are dedicated to any of these programs. Overall, enrollment in programs offered by the CMGS has tended to be very small, with Fall 2001 enrollments shown in Table 10. Similarly, enrollment in CMGS-sponsored courses has been modest, consistently averaging around 150 students per semester, with African American Studies accounting for more than half that number.

Table 10
Enrollments in Center for Multicultural and Gender Studies Academic Programs, Fall 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Concentration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Studies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Studies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American Studies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Studies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Asian Studies minor began in Fall 2001, and Native American Studies minor begins in Fall 2002.

Other curriculum programs that address themes related to diversity and multiculturalism include two of the eight categories in the College’s General Education (GE) Program: GE2 (Prejudice and Discrimination) and GE3 (Contrasting Cultures). Also, effective Fall 1997 all freshmen must enroll in COR 101, a one-credit course that includes a module emphasizing diversity and the benefits of multiculturalism. Several curriculum programs specifically address issues relevant to people with disabilities. Majors in physical education and recreation and leisure studies can complete a concentration in this area, and education has a program leading to teaching certification in special education. Finally, two courses specifically address issues related to gays, lesbians, and bisexuals: The
three-credit INT 230 (Sexism and Heterosexism: An Integrated Study), which is part of the GE2 curriculum, and the one-credit MGS 130 (Society and Sexual Orientation).

All of these curriculum initiatives are beneficial, and perhaps essential, in helping create a campus that values and respects diversity. According to the Admissions Office, having programs such as African-American Studies and Latin American Studies particularly raises the profile of an institution among ethnic minority students who are applying to college. This perspective led the President’s Task Group on the Recruitment and Retention of Ethnic Minority Students to make the following key recommendation in 2000: Raise the status and level of visibility of the African-American Studies, Latino Studies and other ethnic minority academic programs.

It is also necessary to offer academic programs in which ethnic minority students are interested in majoring. Data from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) show that the top six programs in SUNY colleges graduating ethnic minority students are the following in rank order: Elementary education, business administration and management, psychology, sociology, accounting, and communications. The top five programs offered by SUNY Cortland that graduate ethnic minority students are as follows, again in rank order: Elementary teacher education, physical education (teacher certification), health science, communication studies, and economics and management science. These programs accounted for 54.5% of the 604 ethnic minority students that graduated from SUNY Cortland from 1998-99 through 2000-01. Based on this information, SUNY Cortland appears well positioned to market itself to ethnic minority students.

Admissions efforts. Of the groups being considered in this chapter, only ethnic minority students are the focus of specific recruitment efforts by the College. Admissions Office data from 1997 through 2001 on freshmen admissions show significant increases in ethnic minority freshmen applications (from 469 to 1,198, or 155%), acceptances (from 223 to 451, or 102%), and paid/waived deposits (from 32 to 112, or 250%). In Fall 2000 President Taylor made a commitment to increase the presence of ethnic minority students by 10% for each of the next three years. Consequently, Fall 2000 and Fall 2001 have had the largest entering ethnic minority student freshman class ever, with 99 and 112, respectively (with increases of 51% and 13%), thus surpassing the president’s goal of a 10% increase. New ethnic minority student totals (including freshmen and transfers) are also up for Fall 2001, to 152, or 25% compared to Fall 2000. The Admissions Office’s strategies for increasing ethnic minority students’ presence on campus have included hiring ethnic minority staff, making repeated trips to targeted schools in urban areas, collaborating with the College’s Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), and involving ethnic alumni.
Though the Admissions Office serves as the primary recruiter of students for the College, at least two other programs recruit ethnic minority students. EOP, which began as a result of a SUNY system-wide initiative in 1968, targets students for admission who are economically or educationally disadvantaged but capable. Although EOP does not exclusively enroll ethnic minority students, this program typically includes a substantial number, and provides all its students with support in areas such as financial aid, mentoring, and tutoring. From 1998 through 2000 the percentage of ethnic minority students in EOP stayed around 38-39%, increasing to 45% for 2001-02.

More recently, Cortland’s Urban Recruitment of Educators’ (CURE) program was instituted in 1998, and specifically recruits and provides mentoring for ethnic minority students in teacher education programs, providing the College’s largest scholarship awards for four years in exchange for a commitment to teach in urban areas. CURE admitted 43 students in its first four years, with 39 still at SUNY Cortland and 38 still in the program. The CURE director and students collaborate with the Admissions Office to make admissions trips to New York City high schools. The program is funded from a variety of sources including an anonymous foundation, ASC, and a Ford grant as well as the Cortland College Foundation, which contributed $198,000 over the last three years.

Retention efforts. In contrast to admissions efforts, specific programs and services have been designed to retain members of all the student groups of interest in this chapter. For ethnic minority students, a major source of support is the Office of Multicultural Affairs, headed by a full-time multicultural affairs coordinator (MAC). This office oversees multicultural student organizations, provides mentoring to their leaders, organizes campus events including the Blake/Scott Mentor Program and the Alumni Ethnic Dinner, and works with the CMGS’ Student Support Committee on the Challenge for Success Awards Program and the Kente Cloth Ceremony, a special commencement for students of color. The Student Support Committee also addresses issues that affect the quality of campus life for these students, working with the Multicultural Resource Team (described in more detail below) and the vice president for student affairs on problems like bias-related incidents. Further, EOP and CURE provide expanded support to their students once they arrive on campus. EOP offers specialized support through its EOP counselors, a summer institute for first-year students, first-year advising and a mentoring program, while CURE provides a summer orientation, a course for first-semester students, monthly group meetings, and a mentoring program.

For the most part, special services for students with disabilities are coordinated through the Office of Student Disability Services. Gay, lesbian and bisexual students receive support from the Lesbian and Gay Concerns Committee, a standing committee of the CMGS consisting of faculty and staff, and the Rainbow Alliance, a student
organization. Student organizations in fact play an important role in enhancing campus life for underrepresented students at the College, providing academic, social and support activities. Rainbow Alliance, for example, promotes acceptance of all individuals regardless of sexual orientation. Organizations that serve ethnic minority students include the Asian Pacific Student Union, Adowe, the Black Student Union, Caribbean Students, the Gospel Choir, the Greek Balkan Society, Hillel, La Familia Latina, and Women of Color. Organizations that focus on women’s issues are POWER and Women of Color. Table 11 shows a listing of these groups, complete with funding amounts from the Student Government Association (SGA) for the past four years. As this table demonstrates, total funding for these organizations has increased substantially during that time, from $57,300 to $91,320 or 59%.

Table 11
SGA Funding for Multicultural Organizations, 1997-2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pacific Student Union</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adowe</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Student Union</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>21,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean Students</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10,370</td>
<td>10,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospel Choir</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Balkan Society</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillel (Jewish Student Society)</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Familia Latina</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Alliance (GLBA)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women of Color</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, during the 2000-01 academic year President Taylor formed and charged a new group, the Multicultural Resource Team, to provide support and assistance to members of the campus community who believe they have been treated unfairly or harassed on the basis of their race, ethnic background, religion, gender, disability status, sexual orientation, or gender identification or presentation. This six-member team, led by the multicultural affairs coordinator and consisting of staff and students, will also serve to advise the College’s administration if there are crises on campus associated with bias-related incidents.

Campus climate. The SUNY-administered Student Opinion Survey (SOS) contains a number of items related to students’ perceptions of the campus climate with respect to diversity and multiculturalism. Table 12 contains a
summary of those perceptions for 1997 and 2000 and demonstrates that, overall, SUNY Cortland has fared less well
than its sister institutions in these areas, with student perceptions reflecting less positive ratings in almost every case
and with many of these differences statistically significant. In addition, these responses are relatively generalized,
with less positive perceptions of the campus climate for ethnic minorities, students with disabilities, and gays,
lesbians and bisexuals. Further, for most items the College’s standing relative to the other university colleges
declined from 1997 to 2000 despite the fact that for many questions mean responses were more positive in 2000. It
is worth noting that the 5-point response scale utilized on the SOS defines the mid-point of “3” as “neutral” or
“uncertain,” meaning that all mean responses by SUNY Cortland students to these items fall closer toward the
positive (i.e., “agree” or “satisfied”) end of the scale than to the negative (i.e., “disagree” or “dissatisfied”) end.

Table 12
SOS Items Related to Multiculturalism and Diversity on Campus, 1997 and 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOS Item</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extent to which campus helped you appreciate ethnic/cultural diversity</td>
<td>3.15* (12)</td>
<td>3.11* (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial harmony at the college</td>
<td>3.03* (10)</td>
<td>3.25* (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents of racial prejudice by students seldom occur</td>
<td>3.26* (8)</td>
<td>3.37* (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents of racial prejudice by faculty seldom occur</td>
<td>3.54 (8)</td>
<td>3.59* (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents of racial prejudice by administrative staff seldom occur</td>
<td>3.53 (8)</td>
<td>3.57* (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus atmosphere of ethnic, political and religious understanding</td>
<td>3.27 (8)</td>
<td>3.27* (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial and ethnic diversity of student body</td>
<td>3.13* (11)</td>
<td>3.03* (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial and ethnic diversity of faculty and staff</td>
<td>3.35 (8)</td>
<td>3.26* (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural content of courses</td>
<td>3.38* (12)</td>
<td>3.45* (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus response to needs of disabled students</td>
<td>3.13 (9)</td>
<td>3.07* (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus understanding of gay/lesbian/bisexual students</td>
<td>3.14* (11)</td>
<td>3.06* (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scores based on 1 to 5 scale, with higher scores reflecting more positive rankings. Number in parentheses
indicates ranking among the 13 SUNY university colleges. Asterisk indicates significantly less positive response
than average for the SUNY university colleges.

Interestingly, an examination of the transcript of a group interview with students of color conducted by the
President’s Task Force on the Recruitment and Retention of Ethnic Minority Students in 2000 confirms that these
students expressed more dissatisfaction with the general campus climate than with curriculum or other issues. When
asked to provide three ideas that would increase the number of ethnic minority students at SUNY Cortland, the most frequent suggestions involved clubs, social events, and ways of improving the social atmosphere for ethnic minority students. In conjunction with the SOS results, these findings indicate that improvements in campus climate should be a priority in the College’s attempts to attract and retain ethnic minority students.

Although attracting and retaining female students, faculty, and staff to SUNY Cortland is generally not a problem, there is evidence that the campus climate for women could also use improving. A great deal of information is known about this issue, resulting from the efforts of the Committee on the Status and Education of Women (CSEW), beginning in the late 1980's. Specifically, at that time the CSEW developed and administered comprehensive surveys assessing the campus climate for women, with the first round of surveys conducted between 1989-91 with female faculty, professional and administrative staff, classified workers, and students and with male faculty and professional staff. A second round of surveys was administered in 1995 to all female and male employee groups and students, and a third round was conducted with all female and male employees in 1999-2000.

Results from the latest CSEW report indicate that, when compared to the earlier two surveys, there have been few dramatic changes in perceptions of SUNY Cortland’s gender climate over the past decade. General findings that emerged included the perceptions – especially by female respondents – that women’s salaries are lower than men’s, that there are more obstacles to women’s career development, that women receive less respect from colleagues and students, and that there is a need for more education on gender-related issues, for both students and co-workers. Some changes were detected indicating a more positive gender climate. For instance, fewer respondents – both male and female – reported gender inequities in promotion standards, a less respectful campus atmosphere for women compared to men, and incidents of sexual harassment. A smaller proportion of respondents also indicated their belief that it was more difficult for women to meet their career goals at the College.

Interestingly, there were fewer differences among the employee groups than there were between males and females across employee groups, with many striking gender differences revealed in responses. Most obvious was the fact that, almost without exception, men viewed the campus climate for women more positively than women, on virtually every measure. With respect to issues related to sexual orientation, attitudes in 1999-2000 were generally more positive compared to previous years, with a higher proportion of respondents indicating that the College should provide institutional support to gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. This finding was qualified by gender and employee group, however, with males and classified staff generally less supportive of this idea.
Another issue to be addressed with respect to campus climate is the role the College’s athletics program plays in the recruitment and retention of students of interest in the present chapter, in particular ethnic minority students. With its large intercollegiate sports program (with more than 600 athletes, or more than 10% of the undergraduate population) and national reputation among Division III institutions, SUNY Cortland could use its athletic program to attract members of particular demographic groups and therefore influence the representation of those groups in the overall student body. Unfortunately, to this point it is not possible to document the extent to which this strategy has been employed, largely because the College does not track athletes by ethnic minority status. Anecdotal evidence obtained through watching SUNY Cortland’s athletic contests, however, indicates that teams have relatively few ethnic minority athletes. A positive development is that, in its NCAA institutional self-study completed in January 2001, the athletics department committed to implementing strategies that will allow the College to track the recruitment and retention of student athletes on the basis of both ethnic minority status and gender.

An important related topic is gender equity in athletics. For the past two decades SUNY Cortland has taken its gender equity obligations seriously, conducting comprehensive Title IX reviews every three to four years, far more often than comparable colleges. Institutional responsibility for monitoring Title IX compliance lies with the CSEW, which collaborated with the Cortland Intercollegiate Athletics Board to conduct the last Title IX review in 1997. Further, in 2000-01 the CSEW began conducting “mini-reviews” of Title IX compliance that consisted of surveying head coaches regarding their perceptions of gender equity between men’s and women’s teams.

According to the 1997 review, SUNY Cortland did not provide participation opportunities for women and men that were proportionate to their respective rates of enrollment, with females making up only 40% of the total number of intercollegiate athletes. In response, the College added two new women’s sport teams, golf and ice hockey, and by 1999-2000, the percentage of athletes who were female had increased to 46%. While this number is still far below the 58% of women comprising the undergraduate population, the remaining discrepancy between male and female participation in athletics is almost completely attributable to football, a situation that exists for any institution with a football program. Other areas of inequity noted in the 1997 report included the fact that women’s basketball games always preceded men’s games (i.e., as opposed to alternating the game order), more fund-raising by men’s teams, preferable practice scheduling for men’s teams during inclement weather, and better outdoor storage of equipment for men’s sports. The report also pointed out many areas of equity, pertaining to quality of equipment, travel allowances, and per diem rates for food while traveling.
In Spring 1998 President Taylor charged athletics with addressing the inequities revealed in the 1997 review, and the College’s athletic director developed and instituted an action plan for this purpose. By Fall 2000 many of the gender inequities identified in Fall 1997 had been addressed, including the development of high-quality publicity brochures for men’s and women’s sports and the purchase of enclosed bulletin boards for featuring women’s teams in the Park Center. Further, the CSEW’s Fall 2000 coaches’ survey revealed that in general coaches perceived few inequities between men’s and women’s teams, with mean scores on all 31 survey items exceeding the mid-point of “3” on a 5-point scale on which lower ratings indicated less satisfaction with gender equity. Coaches of women’s teams were more likely to perceive some conditions as gender inequitable to the advantage of men’s teams, however, with the following seven items appearing especially problematic: Scheduling of team meeting places and of cheerleading, quality of locker room facilities and of team rooms, release time for coaches, comparability of coaches’ salaries, and equity in funding for field or court maintenance. The CSEW distributed this report to President Taylor, the dean of professional studies, and the athletic director, requesting that institutional attention be accorded to these seven issues in particular. Some progress has already been made in this regard, with the following construction projects completed or near completion: Addition of bleachers and a press box to the softball field and building a new women’s team room in the Park Center.

Community relations. A number of SUNY Cortland units interact frequently with community groups on activities related to access and diversity issues. For instance, many volunteer or internship opportunities exist for students to work with persons with disabilities, underprivileged children and youth, and women in need (e.g., the YWCA’s Violence Against Women Program). Students in physical education work in adaptive aquatic programs provided for the community, and students in recreation and leisure studies promote a Disabilities Awareness Week. A monthly Community Roundtable often includes topics relevant to multiculturalism, and during 1999-2000 the CMGS and the President’s Office sponsored a yearlong “Dialogue on Race” that attracted many participants from the community. In 1998 a task force was formed for the specific purpose of improving relationships between City of Cortland police officers and students of color at the College, and according to the multicultural affairs coordinator, the city police department recently offered a work study program for an ethnic minority student. Other campus and community collaborations include a women’s reading group, a Take Back the Night march to protest violence against women, and candlelight vigils such as the one held in memory of Matthew Shepard, the gay college student brutally murdered in Wyoming.
Outside Cortland, the College has established a task force that meets several times a year to coordinate events with the Onondaga Nation School (ONS) located just south of Syracuse. As a result, ONS students have come to campus to attend concerts, plays, a glass-blowing lab, and a songwriting workshop. College interns have also been placed at the ONS, and for the past three years the school has used the College’s Raquette Lake facility for a community-building retreat, supported in part through a $2000 grant from the President’s Office. Finally, the College has a three-year partnership with Syracuse’s Blodgett Elementary School, a high-needs school placed on the Schools Under Registration Review (SURR) list by NYSED. Faculty have volunteered as classroom aides and conducted workshops for teachers and staff at the school, and for the past two years the College has brought Blodgett students to SUNY Cortland on field trips. In addition, since 1999 the College has donated technology assistance and computers to Blodgett, which at that time had virtually no technology in place.

Analysis

Congruence of College Mission and Goals Related to Access and Diversity

SUNY policies explicitly stipulate that the State University system “shall be free of any discrimination on the basis of race, creed, gender or any other inappropriate criteria,” a sentiment reflected in SUNY Cortland’s own non-discrimination policy included in the College Catalog, position advertisements, and other relevant publications. As stated earlier, the College’s Mission Statement contains clear language committing the College to educating students supportive of a diverse society. SUNY Cortland has operationalized this aspect of its mission through its long range planning process by including it as a priority goal in the last three strategic planning rounds. For the current planning round, the goal related to diversity contains a number of actions for achieving a more diverse campus, some of which derive directly from recommendations included in the President’s Task Group on the Recruitment and Retention of Ethnic Minority Students final report. The money allocated for achieving these goals begins with a base commitment of $40,700 through Spring 2002, to fund the following actions: Supporting the Multicultural Resource Team, developing an affirmative action award for units that excel in this area, offering diversity and conflict training to the campus community, developing a multicultural interest group for students, increasing support to multicultural affairs, developing a support network to help ethnic minority faculty and staff acclimate to the campus, employing special search strategies in units that do not hire an appropriate number of ethnic minorities, and developing programs to advance affirmative action commitments.
Assessment of Programs and Services

SUNY Cortland can take pride in many of its accomplishments related to equity, access, and diversity in the past few years. Applications of freshmen ethnic minority students are up significantly, as is the proportion of new full-time faculty hires, many of the identified inequities in women’s athletics have been lessened or eliminated, perceptions of the campus climate for women and gays, lesbians, and bisexuals have improved over time, and women compose 56% of the upper administrative positions at the College. There are also multiple structures in place to provide support to virtually all groups that need it, the College’s commitment to achieving and maintaining a diverse and accessible campus is expressed clearly and visibly in a variety of contexts, and its curriculum programs cover a wide range of relevant topics, including ethnic and women’s studies, disability issues, and perspectives on sexual orientation.

At the same time, there remain reasons for concern. Despite many concentrated efforts SUNY Cortland has not yet achieved the critical mass of ethnic minority faculty, professional staff, and students it needs to bring about a real change in campus composition and, consequently, the campus climate itself. There is some hope based on the past two years that this critical mass is at last within the College’s reach, but this objective depends greatly on SUNY Cortland’s ability to retain the ethnic minority individuals now coming to the campus.

Another area of concern is the College’s curriculum and its relationship to the institution’s goals for equity, access, and diversity. In the late 1980’s, SUNY Cortland became one of the first colleges in the country to require its students to take a course on racism and sexism as part of its general education category on Prejudice and Discrimination. This development, along with the creation of minors in Jewish Studies, Women’s Studies, African American Studies, and Latin American Studies, gave rise to the hope that this curriculum expansion would help produce a campus that valued multicultural perspectives and celebrated diversity. Close to fifteen years later, it is unclear that these innovative curriculum initiatives have had this impact on SUNY Cortland’s multicultural climate. This conclusion is supported by the SOS results described earlier, including students’ lower satisfaction with the multicultural content of their courses compared to students at peer institutions. Other support includes the fact that student enrollment in SUNY Cortland’s ethnic studies and women’s studies programs has never been strong and remains small, as does the total number of students enrolled in the courses offered by these programs.

It is worth noting that SUNY Brockport, SUNY Oneonta, SUNY Oswego, and SUNY Geneseo show similarly low enrollment figures in programs comparable to SUNY Cortland’s African American Studies program, so it is
possible that students simply are not interested in ethnic or women’s studies at the present time. Discontinuing these programs would raise questions regarding the College’s commitment to multiculturalism, however, and may even hurt recruitment efforts given statements by the Admissions Office that having such programs raises the profile of an institution for ethnic minority students applying to college. It is also possible that the CMGS is not an effective structure for delivering these programs, given there are no faculty lines dedicated to them and most courses are cross-listed with offerings in other departments. In 2000 a committee formed by the dean of arts and sciences to review African American Studies basically reached this conclusion, and recommended elevating that program to department status. SUNY’s enrollment-driven funding formula would make it almost impossible to justify such an action, however, based on the low student numbers that have historically characterized African American Studies.

Explaining the Paradox

The present analysis of equity, access, and diversity reveals many strengths at SUNY Cortland, including strong presidential leadership toward these goals, the infusion of significant resources into these efforts, and, perhaps most important, the clear and persistent commitment of many individuals and groups to these ideals. It is undeniable that progress has been made, and the College is to be applauded in particular for its gains with respect to gender equity. As assessed through two of the measures some people would argue are most important to creating a multicultural campus environment – a strong and visible ethnic minority presence and students’ perceptions of that environment – the College continues to struggle. In an attempt to explain this paradox, the Equity, Access and Diversity Work Group identified two possible contributing factors: 1) a diffusion of efforts related to creating a diverse campus; and, 2) an absence of consistent and systematic evaluation of these efforts.

Diffusion of efforts. A major difficulty in evaluating the College’s status with respect to equity, access and diversity is the fact that efforts related to these ideals are so diffuse and scattered. Even the process of preparing this chapter was complicated by the fact that numerous programs and organizations address these issues, cutting across many organizational levels as well as academic and administrative departments. While such widespread attention to these issues is commendable in some respects, it is not always clear how these programs’ efforts are coordinated to meet larger institutional goals. For instance, the multicultural affairs office and the CMGS’ Student Support Committee both report that advocating for ethnic minority students is central to their mission, and the Admissions Office, EOP, and CURE all attempt to recruit ethnic minority students. Fortunately, there were no reports of conflict among these different units and, indeed, it appears many of these groups work together with excellent
results. A more significant concern is that, with so many units working toward similar objectives, it becomes unclear who is ultimately accountable for ensuring the objectives are achieved.

**Evaluation of effectiveness.** The above description contains many excellent examples of how SUNY Cortland has attempted to assess itself in the areas of equity, access, and diversity, including the periodic campus climate for women surveys, Title IX reviews, and annual affirmative action reports that provide an update on the status of ethnic minority and female hiring and employment across campus. The OIRA provides data on ethnic student enrollment every semester, and progress on long range planning priority goals is monitored on a regular basis. The implementation of the College’s assessment program, which affects all academic major programs including African American Studies and all support and service units including multicultural affairs and student disability services, should provide additional useful information as to the quality and effectiveness of SUNY Cortland’s programs and services in this area. In contrast, the CMGS, which is neither an academic department nor a support and service unit following common definitions, has not been included in the College’s assessment initiative, meaning that an overall evaluation of its effectiveness has yet to be conducted. A final observation is that, apart from the SOS, systematic and campus-wide evaluations of SUNY Cortland’s multicultural climate have not been conducted. The SOS, while valuable, is only administered every three years and just gives insight into students’ viewpoints. Clearly, more regularly-administered surveys, including those that assess the perceptions of faculty and staff, would yield a more comprehensive perspective on these issues and, most important, provide the College with specific recommendations for further improving its programs and services.

**Summary and Recommendations**

The present analysis has revealed many strengths and weaknesses in SUNY Cortland as an institution that values and is dedicated to the principles of equity, access, and diversity. On the basis of this evaluation, one might be tempted to conclude that not much has changed in these areas since the last Middle States reaccreditation review and, indeed, the College has not made the progress it desired in some respects. There are reasons to believe, however, that SUNY Cortland is in a good position to make great strides toward becoming a place where all individuals feel “welcome and wanted” in the near future. Most important, in the last two to three years in particular, these issues have been at the forefront of the institution, and a solid infrastructure has been established for producing even greater success. This infrastructure includes presidential leadership, building these objectives into the College’s long range planning process, the development of innovative programs like CURE, and the recent
infusion of ethnic minority students and faculty into the life of the institution. This momentum must continue, of course, and is likely to under the leadership of a new provost and vice president for academic affairs, who herself is an expert on diversity and multiculturalism in higher education. On the basis of the present evaluation, the Equity, Access and Diversity Work Group recommends the following actions:

1. Add full-time staff position to Office of Multicultural Affairs, so as to provide greater direction to underrepresented student groups, better integrating the offices and programs that relate to diversity and multiculturalism among students and faculty, and better advocating for these persons and groups.

2. Increase frequency of SOS administration in order to better monitor campus climate for underrepresented populations, making sure that these populations are proportionately included in the sample.

3. Include Center for Multicultural and Gender Studies in College’s assessment program, to include assessment of all its academic programs and support functions.

4. Reinstate a program like the Campus Dialogue on Race, which was held in 1999-2000, on a regular basis, with the administration and faculty and staff groups working together to coordinate this event.

5. Create a standing committee on Ethnic Minority Student Recruitment and Retention including representatives from admissions, EOP, advisement and first-year programs, athletics, and multicultural affairs, for the purpose of increasing the visibility of those programs known to be particularly attractive to ethnic minority students and coordinating efforts on orientation, mentoring, and advisement for all self-identified ethnic minority students.

6. Conduct a study on the College’s ability to serve the increasing number of students with disabilities and develop an action agenda working with student disability services.
Introduction

A college’s intellectual climate results from the interaction of multiple variables including faculty characteristics, student traits, institutional values, administrative leadership and support, and access to resources, and it also depends heavily on the history and traditions of an institution. At SUNY Cortland both faculty and students alike have questioned the College’s intellectual culture over the years, and the present chapter closely examines the factors that currently make up that culture. These factors include the range of instructional methods being utilized by faculty, faculty-student interaction outside the classroom, out-of-class learning opportunities, extracurricular learning experiences, student behaviors and socialization issues, academic advisement, and faculty scholarship.

Teaching and Instructional Innovation

SUNY Cortland’s Mission Statement commits the institution to the pursuit of excellence in teaching, scholarship, research, and community service, with quality teaching as the highest priority. The College currently offers programs leading to degrees in over one hundred majors. Its General Education Program aims to provide students with “an intellectual and cultural basis for their development as informed individuals in our contemporary society,” as stated in the College Catalog.

Fourteen of 15 chairs of departments offering graduate programs responded on the Middle States questionnaire to department chairpersons that lecture/discussion was the most common teaching method in their departments’ graduate programs, and 12 reported that seminars are also commonly used. It is almost certain that lecture/discussion is the most common method in undergraduate teaching as well, although data are not available to confirm this impression. Nevertheless, a number of innovations have been adopted at SUNY Cortland, including the development of paired courses and thematic blocks of pedagogical courses organized around a substantive theme. Also, the College’s current long range planning goals include enhancing instructional innovation and infusing technology into instruction, and a total of $42,000 was allocated for 2000-01 and 2001-02 for the express purpose of enhancing instructional innovation.

A recent instructional initiative is the formation of the Faculty Development Committee (FDC) to foster excellence in teaching across campus. As detailed in Chapter 5, the FDC has organized teaching-related workshops
and “book chats,” implemented a Teaching Innovation Grant program, and for the first-time in 2001-02 will recognize excellence in teaching among part-time faculty. The College also encourages outstanding teaching through various awards. Four professors have received the Rozanne Brooks Dedicated Teacher Award since it was endowed in 1998, with this award carrying a $5000 stipend for enhancing teaching practices, and six have been awarded the Student Government Outstanding Teaching Award since 1995. Nine faculty members have received SUNY-administered Chancellor’s Awards for Excellence in Teaching between 1995 and 2001, and one professor was recognized in 2000 as a Distinguished Teaching Professor, SUNY’s most prestigious award for teaching. At present, the College has 22 Excellence award winners and five Distinguished Teaching Professors on staff.

Student-Faculty Interaction

Over a decade ago, the Committee on the Freshman Year in its 1990 report entitled “Toward a More Integrated Academic Community” noted that the physical arrangement of the campus, as well as “social habits” at the College, kept faculty-student interaction outside of class to a minimum. This committee recommended providing “integrating spaces” like snack bars to foster such contact and, as described in Chapter 15, the development of such space remains a priority goal of the College’s facilities Master Plan. There is still a tendency on campus for faculty and students to congregate in separate spaces for meals and refreshments, but nevertheless they interact in various ways. For instance, student clubs have faculty advisors, professors participate in off-campus events such as Crop Walk, Alternative Spring Break, and the Take Back the Night March, and students frequently serve on committees with faculty. On the 2000 Student Opinion Survey (SOS), respondents rated their level of satisfaction with the out-of-class availability of their instructors at 3.75, which placed the College fifth out of the 13 university colleges and significantly higher than the university college average.

Learning Beyond the Classroom

According to information provided by the Office of Career Services, 82% of SUNY Cortland students across nearly every major take part in some form of out-of-class experiential learning, with over 500 students participating in internships for credit each year. Half of the graduates responding to career services surveys in 1998 and 1999 had participated in student teaching, 38% in practicums, 22% in volunteer programs, and 8% in overseas programs. According to the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA), about 600 students each year conduct some type of research for credit with a faculty mentor, including directed study, independent study, and independent
research courses. SUNY Cortland’s outdoor education centers also contribute to out-of-class experiences, with Raquette Lake and Hoxie Gorge used by 1,672 students during 1999-2000.

SOS results demonstrate a general increase in student satisfaction with opportunities for out-of-class learning from 1997 to 2000. Specifically, SUNY Cortland improved its ranking among SUNY university colleges on satisfaction with internship availability from seventh to third (3.43 in 2000) and from sixth to fourth on study abroad program availability (3.78 in 2000). Mean rankings for both these items were significantly better than the university college average, as was the 2000 mean ranking of 3.54 for quality of internships, placing the College fourth among its peers. Satisfaction with community service opportunities did show some decline in terms of ranking, from fourth to sixth, although the average response rose slightly from 3.41 to 3.47 during that time and the 2000 average did not differ significantly from the university college mean. Nearly two-thirds of graduates surveyed by career services in 1998 and 1999 reported that their co-ops, internships, practicum experiences, volunteer work, and student teaching had prepared them well for life after college.

**Extracurricular Learning Experiences**

For a campus its size, a fairly wide variety of cultural and educational events is available at SUNY Cortland. The Performing Arts Department has sponsored an average of ten concerts, three or four plays, and two to three readings per academic year, and the Dowd Art Gallery provides four or five exhibits per year as well as tours, gallery talks and film screenings. Recent exhibits have drawn between 700 and 1,100 visitors each. The Campus Artist and Lecture Series (CALS) Lecture Grant Program has grown considerably over the past four years, now awarding $10,000 annually for events intended to enrich the out-of-classroom experience. Over the past five years, an average of 20% of the funds allocated by the Student Government Association to registered student organizations have gone to academic groups, while arts organizations have received an average of 22%. The Student Activities Board allocates approximately 14% of its annual budget to lecture programs.

**Student Behavior and Socialization**

Based on a review of the Middle States questionnaire filled out by department chairpersons, there is widespread belief among SUNY Cortland’s faculty that a large portion of the institution’s students are poorly prepared and poorly motivated for college-level academic work. Specifically, 16 of 24 department chairs mentioned this as a concern within their departments, whereas only four made positive statements regarding student abilities and attitudes. Eleven chairs reported that faculty in their departments believed there is a drinking culture among the
students that detracts significantly from academic work, and many expressed concern that Cortland has a reputation as a “party school.” These concerns have existed for quite some time. For example, in 1990 the Committee on the Freshman Year called attention to Cortland’s “entrenched, negative public image” and its “reputation for low academic standards and tolerance of ill-prepared students.” Interestingly, current perceptions described by chairpersons may not match reality, with incoming students demonstrating higher academic profiles as described in Chapter 2. Also, the 1997 study by George Dehne & Associates that widely assessed prospective and enrolling students’ views of the College did not confirm the impression that SUNY Cortland was seen as a “party school.”

Academic Advisement

Advisement has been an area of great concern at SUNY Cortland since the Committee on the Freshman Year highlighted it in its 1990 report. The 1997 and 2000 SOS and the 1998 ACT Survey of Academic Advising suggest that the majority of students continue to be significantly dissatisfied with the advisement they receive. The 1999 Report of the Quality Improvement Team on Academic Advising indicated that students were especially unhappy about lack of access to advisors and course unavailability, and suggested that many faculty members are dissatisfied with excessive advisee loads and feel pressured due to the lengthy registration process. Faculty workload information provided by OIRA shows that in Fall 2001 advisee-to-faculty ratios were around 72 in physical education, 46 in exercise and sport studies, 35 in communication studies and in speech pathology and audiology, and 29 in education. Overall, this ratio is around 37:1 for faculty in professional studies and 15:1 in arts and sciences.

Faculty Scholarship

SUNY Cortland has a faculty that is actively engaged in research. Faculty members produced ten books and 77 articles in refereed journals in 1999-2000, ten books and 74 articles in 1998-99, and 9 books and 77 articles in 1997-98. The Office of Sponsored Programs reports that faculty at the College submitted 62 proposals for external grants during 1999-2000, 30 of which were funded, and external grant totals have increased from $914,000 in 1998-99 to $1.89 million in 1999-2000 to $2.1 million in 2000-01. Still, SUNY Research Foundation records show the College ranked tenth among the 13 university colleges in total direct and indirect costs funded by external grants for 2000-01. The College encourages participation in research through the Discretionary Salary Increase (DSI) process, the Faculty Research and Grant Proposal Incentive programs, both of which provide support for the development of projects in their early stages, and Summer Research Fellowships for untenured faculty. Vehicles for recognizing successful grant writing include a yearly publication, Research Review, and an annual Research Recognition
Luncheon launched in 2000. As part of its MOU with System Administration, the College has agreed to increase its total sponsored funding to $4 million by 2005, and President Taylor recently formed a task force to develop a plan to reach this goal, keeping in mind an emphasis on applied research in Cortland’s traditional areas of strength.

Analysis

SUNY Cortland’s Teaching and Learning Environment

SUNY Cortland is fortunate to have a large contingent of faculty who are dedicated to quality teaching and scholarship. A good deal of teaching innovation is going on, much of the credit for which goes to various College-sponsored efforts. In particular, the five-year, $1.75 million Title III grant is promising in this respect, as it provides resources for faculty training in instructional technology, the creation of learning communities, and new ways of utilizing the College’s outdoor education facilities. It does appear, however, that most of the innovation that has occurred over the past five years involves the application of classroom technology (e.g., PowerPoint presentations and on-line discussions) rather than the development of more engaging classroom methods and cooperative learning. It also seems that to this point technology is being infused into instruction largely as a tool for enhancing the traditional lecture/discussion format. As a result, the faculty's expanding knowledge and expertise in these areas may not be addressing the long range goal of instructional innovation as broadly and effectively as it might. A recent needs assessment by the FDC confirms the strong interest in technology, but this committee and other relevant groups may need to attend more to non-technological forms of teaching innovation.

The need for the College to further enhance its teaching and learning experience is strongly supported by data from the SUNY-administered SOS. Table 13 summarizes findings from both 1997 and 2000 for items that relate or contribute to SUNY Cortland’s intellectual climate. As this table shows, in general student perceptions of their academic experience have improved slightly from 1997 to 2000 as measured by mean response scores. Also, mean rankings have improved with respect to intellectual stimulation, frequency of satisfaction with academic experiences, the College’s contributions to intellectual growth, and degree of perceived preparation for a career and further academic study. By contrast, rankings have dropped for frequency of enjoying class, and extent to which students are challenged by their program of study. Perhaps most important, for virtually all items, the College’s mean scores were significantly lower than the university college averages, for both 1997 and 2000.

It is worth noting that, as indicated by the last two items in the table, SUNY Cortland students score significantly lower than the university college mean on exercising good study habits and placing priority on
studying. As such, students’ negative perceptions of the College’s academic climate may be the result of their below average study habits (or vice versa). In either case, the consistency of findings like these indicates that SUNY Cortland has a challenge ahead if it is to reverse students’ impressions of their academic experience as well as help them recognize and assume their own obligations in the learning process. (To reiterate a point made in Chapter 10, in all cases Cortland’s mean scores well exceed the mid-point of “3” on the 5-point SOS response scale, reflecting more positive than negative perceptions overall.)

Table 13
SOS Ratings Related to Intellectual Climate, 1997 and 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOS Item</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often intellectually stimulated by material covered in class</td>
<td>3.35* (12)</td>
<td>3.54* (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often enjoyed class</td>
<td>3.20* (12.5)</td>
<td>3.42* (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often satisfied with academic experiences</td>
<td>3.20* (13)</td>
<td>3.46* (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenged by program of study</td>
<td>3.90* (7)</td>
<td>3.88* (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to intellectual growth</td>
<td>3.62* (10)</td>
<td>3.76 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for further academic study</td>
<td>3.54 (7)</td>
<td>3.67** (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for career</td>
<td>3.53 (7)</td>
<td>3.69** (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise good study habits</td>
<td>3.61* (8)</td>
<td>3.63* (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place highest priority to studying</td>
<td>3.44* (9)</td>
<td>3.35* (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scores based on 1 to 5 scale, with higher scores reflecting more positive rankings. Number in parentheses indicates ranking among the 13 SUNY university colleges. Asterisk indicates scores are significantly lower than average for the SUNY university colleges, while double asterisk indicates scores are significantly higher.

Data bearing on students’ academic preparation are also central to this discussion. While as detailed in Chapter 2 the academic profile of incoming students has improved the last several years, overall these changes have not been dramatic, with average total SAT scores of 1050 and high school GPA’s of 87 in Fall 2001. According to the College’s MOU with System Administration, SUNY Cortland ranks below four of six benchmark institutions in SAT scores, though these differences are not likely significant. The evaluation of the enrollment management unit in 1996 by USA Group Noel-Levitz noted that a relatively large number of entering students were at risk for academic reasons, and that students tended to perceive each other as unprepared for college, conclusions that correspond to more recent findings from the College Student Inventory (CSI) described in Chapter 13.
Through aggressive admissions efforts, facilitated greatly by significant increases in scholarship support, the College is in a better position to attract strong students, and the Fall 2001 incoming freshman class seems particularly promising in this respect. Retaining stronger students can be difficult, however, given the student culture they encounter upon arrival, and this task may be especially challenging with the “type” of student population SUNY Cortland tends to attract as based on SOS and CSI results (i.e., students who are not terribly confident in their own academic abilities or greatly appreciative of academic or intellectual pursuits).

The image that SUNY Cortland needs to project to attract and retain excellent students -- and faculty -- is also threatened by student behavior outside the classroom. Violations of the College’s alcohol policies and guidelines rose by about 20% in 1999-2000, according to the Office of Judicial Affairs, although reported cases involving illicit drugs have been declining. Crime among Cortland students has remained relatively stable during recent years, but there has been an apparent increase in violence reported by university police and the Office of Judicial Affairs, sometimes resulting in serious physical injury. New sanctions for alcohol violations have been imposed recently, but it is too early to assess their impact. Prevention activities related to substance abuse, violence, and sexual assault have been increasingly important goals of the Office of Judicial Affairs, but have been hampered by its workload and limited resources. It is important to note that student misconduct is clearly correlated with class standing, with nearly half of the students referred to Judicial Affairs -- and almost 60% of repeat offenders -- during 1999-2000 freshmen. Rates declined progressively for sophomores, juniors, and seniors.

More positively, the College was successful, through a court injunction sought in association with state and city officials, in ending the biannual student-organized Clayton Avenue block party that drew hundreds of revelers from other campuses, strained community relations, and contributed to the party school image. Cortland has now completed four consecutive semesters without a recurrence of the event, and student affairs officials believe the tradition has been permanently broken. In other actions, the Student Activities Board (SAB) has developed an alcohol-controlled Spring Fling that drew an estimated 2,500 students, faculty, and staff in 2001, and is having some success competing with downtown bars, offering programming that attracts crowds ranging from 80 to 500.

Along these lines, the College appears to have done a good job providing quality cultural and educational programming, especially given budget constraints and the rural nature of the Cortland community. On the Middle States department chairperson’s questionnaire, respondents demonstrated a relatively high degree of satisfaction with SUNY Cortland’s programming efforts, with 33% of the chairpersons volunteering that the College does a
good job of bringing an array of speakers and performers to campus. Several chairpersons, however, also characterized attendance at these events as disappointing, pointing out that students often attend guest lectures either because they are required to do so by their professors, because COR101 requires attendance at extracurricular educational events, or in exchange for extra credit. According to the Campus Artist and Lecture Series (CALS) office, attendance at its lectures over the past five years has averaged about 50. Many faculty also complain that their colleagues set a poor example for students by failing to attend such events in respectable numbers, with nonattendance by faculty undoubtedly exacerbated by the growing number who choose to live in Syracuse or Ithaca.

Overall, it seems fair to conclude that SUNY Cortland has far to go in its efforts to establish a deeply-ingrained and widely-shared intellectual culture, not a new observation by any means. In 1990 the Committee on the Freshman Year specifically called attention to a “...lack of a positive, shared campus identity and ‘spirit’ at Cortland.” Similarly, in 1996 USA Group Noel-Levitz observed that “...there does not seem to be a strong sense of community on campus” and that the College has “few traditions or rituals or rites to mark students’ membership in the institution.” The latter report recommended that SUNY Cortland clarify and communicate the College’s mission to all incoming students and their families, and that it convey high standards and expectations of academic excellence as part of its tradition, at the same time providing necessary support to achieve those standards.

There are mechanisms in place that contribute toward these goals. For example, COR 101, which began in 1997 as a direct result of the Noel-Levitz report, is designed to integrate new students into the intellectual and social life of the campus. The Honors Program doubled its annual admissions three years ago from 20 to 40, Cortland’s chapter of the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi annually recognizes “Students of the Month” for their academic and extracurricular accomplishments, and Parnassus, a journal produced by honors students, publishes examples of excellent student writing each year. An Honors Convocation held each April is a well-attended public celebration of the achievements of the top five percent of each class and provides a venue for academic programs to honor their top students. Finally, four years ago the College instituted Scholars’ Day to celebrate and honor scholarly and creative work by students and faculty. This daylong event is organized like a professional conference, with a plenary session and numerous smaller concurrent sessions. Classes are suspended for the day, though many professors require their students to attend Scholars’ Day sessions.

Still, what may be lacking is one or more ceremonial events early in the fall semester to set an intellectual tone for the upcoming academic year -- perhaps an opening convocation in which faculty, students, and parents are all
strongly encouraged to participate. Hopefully such an event would be particularly important in making an
impression on freshmen, given the correlations described above between student misconduct and class standing.
Although the College’s attempts to hold such a convocation for a few years in the 1990’s were relatively
unsuccessful in terms of attendance, a new effort might be more likely to succeed because of the significant turnover
in faculty and the higher academic ability students the College is tending to enroll.

Academic Advisement

The consistent and strong unhappiness with SUNY Cortland’s advisement program, expressed by students and
faculty alike, may reflect confusion and even disagreement about the purpose of advisement. Many students view
advisement as synonymous with scheduling and course registration, and students become upset with their advisors
when they do not get the course or course sections they want. Faculty, however, are more likely to view advisement
as academic and career counseling, and feel that students should take primary responsibility for course and program
choices. Until there is greater consensus as to the purpose of advising, mutual dissatisfaction will likely continue.

In 1998 the Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Advisement, a Faculty Senate Committee, made four
recommendations for improving advisement: 1) development of a new model of advisement; 2) adoption of an
institutional mission statement on advisement; 3) implementation of systematic and ongoing evaluation of the entire
advisement process; and, 4) reassessment of the survey methodology for all future student surveys on advisement.
The mission statement for advisement was completed in 2000 and is published in the College Catalog and the
College Handbook. A Quality Improvement Team on Academic Advising was organized in 1999 to address the
recommendations made by the Ad Hoc Committee, and issued its own recommendations on how to follow up on the
1998 report. At this time, however, these recommendations have not been implemented. Still, numerous efforts
have been made to clarify advising systems and practices, to increase support to advisors, to better understand
student concerns on this topic, and to foster greater student involvement in the advising relationship. The formation
of the Center for Advisement and First-Year Programs, the development of a yearly advisement seminar through the
Title III grant, the creation of an advisor newsletter, and the infusion of advisement issues into COR 101 are all
positive steps. Other projects include the creation of a college-wide advising manual, expansion of advising
seminars and support materials, and construction of an advising web site. The Advisement Office’s plans for 2000-
01 include the establishment of an advising award and continued efforts to acknowledge the role of advising more
explicitly in faculty review and development.
SUNY Cortland’s advisement process may soon reap great benefits from technology applications, with the implementation of on-line registration on the horizon through the BANNER 2000 student information system. This change will make the registration process itself considerably more convenient for students, and may well reduce some of their frustration with “advisement” as they understand it. Unless on-line registration requires direct student contact with advisors at some point in the process, however, the advisor-student relationship may in fact suffer, since it may further reduce the time faculty and advisees spend in face-to-face interaction. This issue was discussed at the first Title III-funded advisement workshop in January 2001, and the College’s registrar is aware of its importance and intent upon making certain that on-line registration builds in faculty consultation and input.

Faculty Scholarship

As described earlier, there are signs that research and scholarly activity at the College continue to improve. Attendance at Scholars’ Day has been good, with sessions drawing an average audience of 35.5 and 35.6 in 2000 and 2001, respectively. Of the approximately 100 presentations made each Scholars’ Day, the percentage of presentations with faculty and students as co-authors has increased from about 10% in 1997 to about 20% in 2001. In addition to providing faculty and students with an opportunity to highlight their research, Scholars’ Day emphasizes the importance of scholarship and therefore contributes positively to the College’s intellectual climate.

Further, there is every reason to believe that research and scholarship will increase even more in the next few years, given the over 50% turnover in SUNY Cortland’s full-time faculty the past four years. The continuing trend toward the almost exclusive hiring of new people with terminal degrees from research universities has undoubtedly solidified scholarly productivity as a priority among the faculty, as will the MOU commitment to expand funded research described earlier. An excellent example of faculty initiative in this area is an informal discussion group on writing for publication that was organized by a junior member of the English Department in late 1999. This group has drawn an average of seven participants to its meetings, including tenured and untenured faculty, staff, and advanced students.

Still, high advisement and teaching loads serve to impede the faculty’s ability to achieve its full potential in teaching innovation and scholarly activity, especially in professional studies departments where number of advisees and total course sections taught per semester typically far exceed those in arts and sciences. Heavy advisement and teaching demands, especially when combined with the effort that must be directed toward the NCATE and NYSED certification processes described in Chapter 14, make it extremely difficult for these faculty to conduct ongoing
research projects during the academic year. The College recently made a giant step toward easing this situation in the education department, by reducing faculty teaching load from eight sections per year to seven, effective Fall 2001. The cost of this action has been prohibitive, making similar adjustments in other departments unlikely for the near future. Still, it represents an extremely positive response to a serious institutional problem, and will be especially beneficial in a department like education with so many new, full-time faculty.

Other factors at the present time that serve to inhibit teaching innovation and faculty scholarship across the College include the NCATE and NYSED certification processes described above, the intrusiveness of the SUNY Board of Trustees in the general education curriculum (viewed by many faculty as politically-motivated), and the College’s assessment initiative. Though these issues have been addressed comprehensively in other chapters, they deserve at least brief mention here because of their perceived impact on the College’s intellectual climate. For example, on the Middle States questionnaire to department chairpersons, respondents revealed that accreditation and assessment activities had taken valuable time and energy that otherwise would have been spent on productive scholarship and experimentation in the classroom. Ten department chairs volunteered that accreditation work has been detrimental to the College’s intellectual climate or morale, while another seven cited complaints by faculty regarding the considerable and, in their view excessive demands on their time and energy resulting from the implementation of new assessment procedures. Fortunately, the demands of recertification and accreditation are cyclical, and once assessment plans are up and running the amount of time they take away from teaching and scholarship will diminish. For the time being, however, each of these activities is widely perceived as a distraction from teaching and research responsibilities.

A final issue, the decline in arts and sciences enrollments, is covered comprehensively in other chapters yet deserves mention here because of its profound implications for the College’s intellectual climate. As stated in the Commission on Higher Education’s accreditation standards, a strong and stable arts and sciences base is critical for any institution of higher learning in the 21st century. The significant and rapid loss of arts and sciences majors at SUNY Cortland has been accompanied by a gradual shift in faculty lines from that school to professional studies, with continuing enrollment trends suggesting the likelihood of further shifts in the future. These developments seriously threaten the College’s liberal arts base and therefore could represent a potential crisis for the institution. Administration-led efforts like the Title III grant, with its provisions for faculty development, advisement, and the development of attractive liberal arts major programs that also appeal to students’ understandable concern with
career applications, must continue, not only to achieve more balanced enrollments but to preserve the liberal arts character of the College. Faculty in the arts and sciences must also assume more responsibility for enrollments in their own programs, and there is evidence this is happening, with departments like political science working closely with admissions and others like chemistry collaborating with institutional advancement to establish scholarship programs for their students through alumni. Together, these efforts will contribute to the practical objective of enrollment equilibrium between the schools and, just as importantly, reinforce the educational value of liberal learning for all students.

Summary and Recommendations

This chapter describes SUNY Cortland’s efforts over time to inculcate an environment that celebrates and honors intellectual pursuits and that is shared by students and faculty alike. It also outlines the difficulties inherent in such a task, especially when faculty and students are unsure of each other’s abilities, interests, or motivations. More positively, the College seems to be in a period of unparalleled potential for making great strides in deepening its intellectual climate based on the influx of new talented faculty, the increase in higher academic ability students, and the recent implementation of initiatives designed to bring visibility to academic pursuits and achievements. On the basis of this evaluation, the following actions should be taken with respect to the College’s intellectual climate:

1. Increase faculty development efforts aimed at non-technological aspects of innovative teaching.

2. Form a task force consisting of College’s Distinguished Teaching Professors and Excellence Award winners for the purpose of directly addressing SUNY Cortland’s problems with intellectual climate as revealed by negative SOS ratings as well as CSI findings, with specific recommendations to be made for resolving these problems.

3. Institute annual Opening Convocation or other event at beginning of year to set serious academic tone for incoming students.

4. Appoint task force to explore ways to boost faculty and student attendance at cultural events on campus.

5. Implement past recommendations regarding advisement.

6. Expand efforts to ease teaching and advisement loads in departments with high ratios of majors to faculty.

7. Continue and reinforce efforts to bolster enrollments in arts and sciences beyond the Title III grant initiative, using strategies that foster communication and a sense of common purpose between the faculty of the two schools as well as the administration.
TECHNOLOGY
CHAPTER 12
Description

In SUNY Cortland’s 1997 Periodic Review Report to Middle States, changes in technology in the preceding five years were described as “stunning” and, as seen in the present chapter, this area continues to advance in dramatic ways. Responsibility for planning, coordination, and management of information and technological resources is shared among academic computing services, administrative computing services (including telecommunications), Memorial Library, and classroom media services, all housed in the College’s information resources (IR) unit. This chapter describes the campus’ major technology-related achievements since 1997 and analyzes their impact on the institution’s programs and services, with a focus on access to technology, training opportunities, and changes in the College’s teaching and learning environment.

History and Relation to Mission

The College’s IR unit was formed in 1993 by combining the Campus Computer Center, Memorial Library, the Telecommunications Department, and the Sperry Learning Resources Center. Goals and objectives related to technology have changed substantially since the mid-1990’s, from developing a campus information and technology infrastructure to providing services and resources that depend on that infrastructure. Indeed, the completion of the fiber optics data communications network for all academic and residence hall buildings represents the single most significant change since 1997, and during 2000-01 more than eight million hits opened thousands of web pages generated by faculty members, students, and campus programs and offices. Other important advances include: 1) establishment by academic computing of the Technology Help Center; 2) completion of full network capability in Old Main, with seven new computer labs and seven technology classrooms all housing state-of-the-art equipment; 3) a significant improvement in access to technology; 4) a tremendous increase in the number of lab desktops; 5) provision of network access through HallNet to all students living in residence halls; and 6) approval by the President’s Cabinet of a rolling replacement plan for desktop technology. It is important to note that this last action was never funded due to resource limitations.

The College’s technology-related goals and objectives are closely aligned with its mission, as reflected in the Mission Statement which includes the following assertion: “All students have opportunities to develop and utilize technology in their studies while also assessing the impact of technology on individuals and societies.” These kinds
of activities have also been part of the College’s long range planning process since 1996 and directly support the present priority goal to “infuse technology across the College, for both instructional and non-instructional purposes.” Finally, in its All-College Student Learning Goal, the College states its intention to produce students who “possess the skills to gather relevant information, evaluate it critically, and communicate it effectively to an audience in written and oral forms,” an objective that depends greatly on progress in technology and information literacy.

**SUNY Cortland’s Organizational Structure for Technology**

In addition to the IR unit, the College addresses its technology-related goals and objectives through an interdisciplinary center, the Center for the Advancement of Technology in Education (CATE). According to its mission statement, CATE intends to “educate faculty and students in the theory and practice of current and emerging instructional technologies,” and it also serves to oversee the College’s Computer Applications Program (CAP), an interdisciplinary minor. Other CATE activities have included promoting discussion among faculty and professional staff regarding software and hardware needs, and this group has also administered a number of surveys across campus designed to clarify this issue as well as others. Another group, the Information Resources Advisory Committee, is charged with making “recommendations to the president, through the associate vice president for information resources, on matters of equipment acquisition, future planning, budget priorities, and related issues in the areas of information resources.”

**Technology Resources**

Today with a staff of 12.5 positions, academic computing supports a large network of servers, 2,250 computers and 6,500 peripherals for all administrative and academic offices, computer labs and special computing sites, and residence halls. Each new faculty member hired since 1996 has been issued a new computer, while senior faculty have either received new or upgraded machines. Older computers are reconfigured for Internet, part-time faculty use, and other applications, and presently 29 laptop computers are available for loan by faculty.

SMART classrooms incorporate the use of technology to enhance the learning experience of the student. There are currently 34 SMART classrooms available out of approximately 120 classrooms, with 13 additional computer labs with computer projection capability. In 2000-01 approximately one hundred faculty used the SMART classrooms for 6,865 actual class-use hours. SMART classroom technology training for faculty is provided on an individual and departmental basis each semester, and classroom media services (CMS) also provides training in the use of the LCD projectors in the computer labs.
The role of multimedia in instruction has increased significantly in the past two years, largely due to the institution of the Provost’s Multimedia Grant program, which has funded 20 proposals for a total of $15,000. These efforts were recently enhanced when Memorial Library installed a new multimedia studio. Departments, faculty, staff, and students have been prolific in their creation of web pages as well as their use of the Internet to distribute information, and bandwidth has been expanded to six meg, with an additional seven meg scheduled to be added.

Finally, the use of the new student information system BANNER 2000 has enabled admissions, financial aid, advisement, student accounts, residential services, and the Registrar’s Office to integrate their databases to serve students more effectively. The Registrar's Office places all course and registration information on-line so students can access and use it to make registration easier. Students can also access their grades and names of advisors on-line, and beginning in Spring 2002 BANNER 2000 will be used for web-based registration.

**Distance Learning**

SUNY Cortland offered its first distance learning courses in Spring 1997, and has regularly sent and received upper-division philosophy courses resulting from a partnership with SUNY Brockport and SUNY Fredonia. Courses are also offered synchronously in the College’s CAS program to Corning Community College, as well as in various graduate programs to the Mohawk Valley Graduate Center. Overall, SUNY Cortland has sent 48 courses from its distance learning facilities since 1997, and has received twelve, with 580 students at Cortland and 315 at distant sites participating. Enrollments have been uneven, however, ranging from 158 total students in Fall 1998 to nine in Fall 2000. Also, the number of distance learning courses has steadily declined over time, with only six courses provided in 2000-01 serving a total of 58 students.

Since Fall 1999, SUNY Cortland has offered 19 asynchronous courses on-line through the SUNY Learning Network (SLN), with five additional courses cancelled due to low enrollments. For the most part, these courses have been provided through exercise science and sport studies, physical education, recreation and leisure studies, English, and international communications and culture. Overall, 163 students have taken these courses, with the largest number (57) enrolled in Spring 2000. Still, as is the case with the synchronous course offerings, enrollments have not been consistent over time, dropping in Fall 2000 to eight students but rebounding somewhat to 23 in Spring 2001. Also, the College provides significantly fewer courses through the SLN compared to other SUNY institutions, offering only 19 of a total of more than 1,500 SLN courses provided to date.
Synchronous learning courses are assessed in the same manner as traditional classes, through the College’s Course Teacher Evaluation process, but formal assessment of asynchronous courses by SUNY Cortland has not taken place. (The SLN anonymously assesses its entire course offerings each semester, but this evaluation is done in total, not course by course.)

Information Literacy

Information literacy programs are increasingly available to students, most of which have been provided through Memorial Library’s Instructional Services Program. Accessibility to programs is very good, with 3,000 or more students receiving instruction annually in information literacy. Overall, there has been a 54% increase in Information and Computer Literacy workshops over the past five years and a 48% increase in attendance. Student technology workshops are designed to serve as a foundation toward the objective of information and computer literacy, giving students needed skills to do research required in their coursework, and subject-related instruction is also offered. In addition, the Composition Library Information Program (CLIP), a requirement of English composition or CPN 101, contributes greatly to information literacy. Through CLIP, students are exposed to search terms and strategies, full-text databases, and strategies for evaluating information effectively. All students except those who transfer in with CPN 101 are required to take this course and successfully pass CLIP prior to graduation.

Other instructional service programs offered by Memorial Library to students, faculty, and staff include Lexis, Nexis, TMC Homepage, Searching the Web, Library Homepage, and Academic Dishonesty: How to Avoid It. Faculty and staff training programs are also held on a regular basis through the Faculty Training Center, and more than 1,000 faculty and staff attended over 200 workshops during 2000-01. In response to growing demand, Memorial Library implemented the Interactive Reference Area and the Park Center Information Center, and the main library extended its opening hours.

Analysis

Technology Utilization and Demand

Perhaps the strongest evidence of technology usage at the College is the expansion of the network, computers, and technology classrooms. As is true at colleges nationwide, the problem of timely access to internet technology at SUNY Cortland relates to bandwidth issues, though this issue was addressed somewhat during Summer 2001, with bandwidth increased sixfold. This action will likely bring only temporary relief, since the number of persons using the campus network continues to grow and applications become increasingly more sophisticated. According to the
SUNY Cortland web site, which tracks hits, two thirds of these hits come from remote access locations. Web user surveys show that faculty, staff and students are also concerned about the lack of server space, and there is a desire for more recycled computers to serve across campus as E-mail Express stations.

Utilization of the Technology Help Center shows a considerable increase in student, faculty, and staff calls with more than 10,000 walk-in, phone, and e-mail contacts during 2000-01. About 80% of the contacts receive an immediate response while 20% have hardware, software, or network needs that require additional time. In 1998, a Student Help Desk was added, and usage of this resource has tripled since its inception. Help Desk personnel have begun to monitor the amount of time it takes to resolve student complaints as well as student lab usage.

SMART classrooms are in very high demand and require advance scheduling from the dean of each school and the Registrar’s Office. Previous assessments conducted by CATE indicated faculty needed support staff specifically assigned the task of developing instructional materials, as well as release time and incentives to attend training, and some of these activities will be supported through the current long range planning process described below. CMS has implemented a process of electronically monitoring usage in ten classrooms with programmable control systems, and future system upgrades will allow this type of assessment in all rooms. CMS also has informally assessed SMART classroom needs and usage through the use of e-mail, previous delivery requests, trouble calls, work order requests, and personal contacts. As part of the College’s assessment program, current IR unit assessment plans include an ongoing process of surveying faculty and other users in order to accommodate future needs. Classroom needs assessment is based on statistics from a database and from written requests, resulting in the construction of more SMART classrooms as funds become available.

**Technology Resources and Planning**

The current budget for information resources is $4.7 million, made possible in part through a $75 per student per semester technology fee instituted in 1995. While this figure represents almost a 50% increase since 1996-97, 60% of the $4.7 million is committed to personnel costs. Under the direction of the associate vice president for information resources (AVPIR), each IR unit prepares recommendations for budget requests within its annual report, and fiscal resources are then appropriated. Additional funding for technology has been made possible by the College’s Title III grant, which allocates a total of $203,460 to be spent from 2000-05 on hardware and software.

Still, budget inadequacies make it difficult for the College to meet its objectives related to technology and information and computer literacy, and feedback from multiple sources demonstrates that faculty perceive these
areas as greatly under-funded. In 1998 CATE surveyed faculty regarding their instructional technology needs and found the most frequently cited problem was lack of personnel support for the use of technology. Indeed, the number of support staff, currently six, has not nearly kept pace with the increase in SMART classrooms. A 1999 survey revealed that, although faculty using these classrooms revealed generally high satisfaction with the facilities themselves, respondents indicated they needed more instruction on how to use the classrooms, especially with respect to minor troubleshooting. CMS annual reports for the past two years indicate that this need is now being addressed. Concerns remain, however, related to staff losses due to attrition and the need for Memorial Library to provide more on-line databases while at the same time facing funding constraints. For example, total acquisition expenditures for the library increased less than $15,000 from 1998-99 but its expenditures for electronic resources grew more than $50,000, to $60,024!

For all these reasons, according to annual reports prepared by the AVPIR budget and staffing are the top two priorities when developing plans for the unit, and virtually all data that have been gathered influence the planning process. As an example, the finding that students needed access to Help Desk services that were more convenient for them led to the inclusion in the 2000-02 Long Range Plan of a strategy for increasing and funding evening Help Desk hours. Also, the Library Late Night Reading Room provides expanded hours for access to computers. Other data sources used for planning purposes include the number of distance learning courses sent and received, the number of special purpose and general purpose computer labs as well as classes scheduled in them, the total technology training sessions conducted by IR staff, the number of on-line computer accounts maintained by faculty, staff, students, and guests, and totals for new hardware installations, including new computers, reassigned computers, and peripheral equipment. Qualitative information is also gathered as well, largely through user surveys. Two ad hoc committees under CATE also engage in long range planning for the expansion of technology and technology education. Specifically, these committees address distance learning and competencies required of new teachers under New York State’s new teacher certification standards, and how the CAP program will address these requirements. Further, CATE’s 1999-2000 annual report identified actions to be taken in the future to enhance its role in planning for technology education, including a faculty survey to determine the use of technology as part of the teaching/learning process with an emphasis on student use of technology. Such a survey would be a good step toward the systematic integration of faculty into the process of planning for the development of technology.
A final point to be covered with respect to technology and planning involves the College’s long range planning process. In particular, the priority goal related to technology and information literacy in the 2000-02 long range plan establishes a number of actions to be undertaken, including providing funds to support faculty innovation in technology, ensuring the College’s web site is ADA-compliant, establishing a technology contingency fund, establishing technology roundtables, assessing the need for evening technology needs and improving access to the CAP program, developing technology intensive courses and degree requirements, and assessing the feasibility of extended adaptive technology to the middle/lower campus. For 2000-01 and 2001-02, $48,100 has been provided to fund these activities.

Assessment of Programs and Services

As stated earlier, IR relies on a variety of data sources to determine its effectiveness, and many examples have already been described. Overall, there has been a shift in the past year toward more formalized and quantifiable assessment with the implementation of the College’s assessment program for support and service units, and many of the results yielded through that process have been favorable. For instance, Faculty Training Center workshops offered through Memorial Library receive high satisfaction ratings, with less than 1% of evaluation forms indicating sessions were viewed as less than “very good” or “excellent.” Responses from a 1998 CMS survey showed general satisfaction with classroom technology facilities, but frustration that these classrooms were not more readily available for scheduling, resulting in 24 additional classrooms being upgraded with instructional technology. Academic computing services administered a lab survey in Spring 2001 that is still being analyzed, but preliminary results showed high student satisfaction and heavy use of labs, with 98% of equipment in labs in working order. Also, statistics from the Technology Help Center indicate 85% of questions or requests are satisfied on the first call. Finally, administrative computing regularly monitors the campus data communications network in order to detect problems and malfunctions as soon as possible. This past year, the network was down less than 1% of the time.

On the 2000 Student Opinion Survey (SOS), students rated access to the College’s computing facilities an average of 3.65 on a 5-point scale, or fifth among the 13 university colleges. Similarly, the average rating for the College’s computing laboratories was 3.56, or sixth among the university colleges. These results were generally consistent with 1997 SOS findings. According to the College’s 1998 Graduate Survey, when asked to rate their perception of computer skills acquired while obtaining their degree at SUNY Cortland, 27.9% of 613 respondents answered they received “extensive” training, with 61.1% answering that they received “some” training. On the 1999
Alumni Opinion Survey (AOS) administered by SUNY, former students ranked their computer instruction at Cortland an average of 2.97 on a 5-point scale, or sixth among university colleges. Given the greatly increased emphasis on technology at the College in the last few years, future graduate and alumni surveys should yield far more positive findings.

It is also important to understand the status of incoming students’ computer and information technology knowledge and skills and, towards that end, in Fall 2001 CATE administered a survey to all students in COR 101. According to survey results, over 95% of these first-year students owned a computer at home, and more than 81% brought a computer with them to college. An overwhelming majority indicated they used a PC/Windows computer; with only 1.4% owning a MAC.

In terms of actual usage, 99% of respondents said they had word processing skills, and the majority had experience using web browsers, presentation software, and painting/drawing software. Less than 15% of these students, however, had experience with databases, spreadsheets, web authoring, and publishing software. Students’ e-mail habits were also assessed because the campus e-mail system has become a popular vehicle with which to communicate with students. Only 82% of the respondents indicated that they had a SUNY Cortland e-mail account, even though such access is free for all students. 69% said they had more than one e-mail account, with AOL being the most popular, and in fact more of these students use AOL as their primary e-mail account than the campus e-mail system (39% compared to 23%); HotMail users account for another 22%. These data demonstrate strongly that students are choosing not to use the campus e-mail system, findings that are consistent with a Student Affairs Committee report to the Faculty Senate in 2000. According to this report, despite the fact that multiple informational and educational opportunities are available for students to learn about campus e-mail system, increasingly students are not using it due to the excessive number of messages sent to all students from student groups and college offices.

Technology as Innovation

Incorporation into teaching and learning. The growing number of faculty who routinely incorporate technology into their teaching is evidenced by the high demand for SMART classrooms as well as by the creation of department-specific computer labs that support instruction in psychology, international communication and culture, English, mathematics, and exercise science and sport studies, among others. Faculty also utilize technology to support their courses through on-line testing, such as in the use of Question Mark in ten psychology courses.
Similarly, since 1997 there has been a steady increase each year in web-based instruction (e.g., Top Class, Web CT). The $1.75 million Title III grant will have an enormous impact on this area, not just on individual courses but by facilitating the development of new major programs (geographic information systems or GIS, new media: graphic design, new media: communications) that rely on state-of-the-art technology applications, training, and equipment.

Two illustrative examples of faculty innovation in instructional technology include the GIS program and the Environmental Thematic Methods Block (evTMB) in the education department. GIS technology has rapidly come to play an important role in several academic disciplines. The current GIS lab, established in 1997, has 22 workstations, a large overhead projector connected to an instructor’s machine, and five printers. In addition, the lab has a Trimble Global Positioning System (GPS), Community Base Station and three portable GPS units. As an early adopter of ArcView GIS software, the College holds an unlimited copy site license and is also recognized as an Environmental Science Resources Institute (ESRI) Authorized Learning Center.

The evTMB, which utilizes Apple laptop computers and wireless technology, involves the integration of elementary education methods courses taken by preservice teachers. Specifically, the evTMB uses the topic of environmentalism as a foundational theme and technology as a tool of pedagogical inquiry and delivery to explore disciplinary connections among science, math, and social studies, with some of the classes taking place at the College’s Camp Huntington facility in the Adirondacks. This program received tremendous nationwide recognition in May 2001 when it was featured on Apple’s web site.

Institutional support for, and faculty interest in, the infusion of technology into the classroom is also evidenced through the Multimedia Grant Program sponsored by the provost’s office described earlier. In the last two years, 44 faculty members submitted proposals for the 20 grants awarded. Under the provisions of the Title III grant, at least 88 faculty members will receive training in different applications of instructional technology and use that training to modify existing or develop new courses. Further, many faculty research projects are conducted over the Internet, and SUNY Cortland faculty collaborate with colleagues at other institutions on their research. Faculty also share the results of their uses of instructional technology at conferences, as can be seen by the presentation of 64 papers at the SUNY-wide Conference on Information Technology over the last five years.

Advances in instructional technology have also, appropriately enough, greatly enhanced SUNY Cortland students’ educational opportunities above and beyond those described earlier. For instance, students may now apply their technological expertise to real world settings through the Technology Internship Program (TIP) created through...
Title III support. In addition, the *Dragon Planet*, an innovative international web-based magazine, provides SUNY Cortland students with unparalleled experience in electronic media (http://ezdragon.cortland.edu). The quality of this project was recognized in Spring 2001 through the awarding of a FIPSE grant, which will support this project for the next two years. Finally, one third of all student presentations at Scholars’ Day over the past three years have utilized presentation technology, attesting to these students’ technological competence.

Despite all these positive developments, there is still room for improvement in SUNY Cortland’s approach to technology and its application to teaching and learning. According to feedback provided by reference librarians, while professors have increased the extent to which they require students to evaluate on-line resources in their courses, there is still a need for greater infusion of this requirement into the curriculum overall. In addition, aside from the very general All-College Student Learning Goal, SUNY Cortland does not have a campus-wide definition of student competence in the use of technology, nor does it have a formal assessment plan for this area. Given the fact that there are no uniform standards for competence in technology across academic programs, and that programs vary in the extent to which they require experience with technology, it is possible that at least some if not many SUNY Cortland students graduate without acquiring a foundation in this critical area.

Finally, a third problem involves the declining interest described above in distance learning courses at the College, despite the fact that much money has been expended to construct excellent facilities. One explanation may be that the College has yet to develop a core of interested and committed faculty members or to identify programs most likely to attract justifiable enrollments over time. In addition, in the past the College has not consistently offered faculty incentives for developing distance learning courses. Further, campuses that have more successfully developed distance learning programs have tended to serve more non-traditional populations, and SUNY Cortland has never attracted large numbers of adult learners. A review of institutions that have successfully moved into this arena, such as SUNY New Paltz and Tompkins Cortland Community College, shows that these colleges had adequate funding to support course development by faculty, technical assistance during the development and implementation phases, and staff to coordinate and market the overall program.

**Use of technology in support and service units.** Reports from the College’s support and service units indicate that virtually every unit makes full use of the computer technology available to them. In some areas, technology is a principal tool of the office, as is the case in enrollment management and its utilization of BANNER 2000 in almost all its functions. Similarly, the Alumni Office and Cortland College Foundation use sophisticated database
management systems to track data. Most offices also reported that their staff members were adequately trained in new technology, either through courses offered by IR or through their own efforts. Overall, based on these reports technology appears to be well integrated into the daily operations of the College, and personnel are using it without excessive difficulty.

These reports also revealed innovative uses of technology, with both the physical plant and academic computing stating that they had installed tracking systems that monitor service orders closely, providing up-to-date information on their status. The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment uses TracDat, a powerful assessment software package that assists in tracking and coordinating the College’s assessment program, and recreational sports has adapted BANNER 2000 to check identification cards in the College’s fitness facilities. The Academic Success and Achievement Program supports a technology lab for students with disabilities, while university police officers have laptop computers in their patrol cars, enabling instant communication. Finally, the Office of Sponsored Programs submits grant proposals electronically, and disseminates grant information the campus community on-line. All these innovations allow for more effective and efficient work at SUNY Cortland.

Summary and Recommendations

The present analysis indicates that SUNY Cortland has managed to make enormous gains in the areas of technology and information literacy in the past decade, both in the teaching and learning process and in the programs and services offered by support units. In the future, the College should continue to view technology as most useful when it is cast in a variety of roles. For instance, in its role as a subject, technology provides students with technical skills essential for today’s work force, and the development of these skills should be a focus of educators at all levels. As a complement to existing curriculum, technology serves to enhance the traditional curriculum and make it more lively and exciting. As a tool to broaden delivery channels, technology contributes to parity and equity, such as when distance learning opens the college classroom to adult learners who would otherwise not have the opportunity, or when adaptive technology makes it possible for anyone to access the internet, despite visual, auditory, or other disabilities. Similarly, technology serves to increase equality in information access, giving more people than ever before unprecedented access to great works of art, literature, and vast information sources.

On the basis of this evaluation, the College should implement the following actions with respect to technology:

1. Continue to seek ways of funding increased bandwidth and server space, in conjunction with implementing strategies for prioritizing access to the College’s communications network.
2. Ensure that all academic programs include clear and appropriately rigorous competencies in the areas of information and computer literacy.

3. Develop a comprehensive definition of student competence in information and computer literacy and implement an assessment process college-wide to assess this competence, perhaps in conjunction with the SUNY general education assessment initiative.

4. Ensure that faculty are given a larger role in planning for technology, perhaps through CATE, SCAP (Student Computer Access Program), and the Information Resources Advisory Committee.

5. Develop and fund an operational and financial technology plan that addresses staff and resource support, replacement of classroom equipment, computer hardware and software in offices and labs, networking upgrades, and upgrades in current SMART classrooms.

6. Develop and fund a plan that provides adequate technical support and instruction to the increasingly technology-sophisticated needs of faculty and staff.

7. Develop a college-wide plan for distance learning and periodically assess faculty and student needs with respect to distance learning for the purpose of planning for future programs.

8. Periodically assess SMART classroom use to ensure that facilities are being used appropriately for the technology provided.

9. Develop and fund a plan to ensure that Memorial Library’s budget increases are commensurate with its expenditures for electronic resources, so that its funding for more traditional learning materials is not further eroded.
INTERNAL INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

CHAPTER 13

Description

Introduction

Understanding SUNY Cortland’s internal institutional context requires identification of key stakeholders inside the institution as well as analysis of key factors from within that both influence and reflect the College’s campus climate. SUNY Cortland has multiple internal stakeholders to whom it is accountable, first and foremost of which are its students. The College meets its responsibility to students by offering appropriate and high-quality curricular programs, academic support services, and student life programs, and this responsibility is clearly delineated in various publications, chiefly the College Catalog. Additional internal stakeholders include the faculty, professional staff members, the administration, and other campus groups such as the Faculty Senate and various collective bargaining agencies. In many ways, the College’s accountability to these groups is defined through policies, procedures, and regulations contained in the College Handbook, the State University of New York Policies of the Board of Trustees, and different collective bargaining agreements.

At the present time the factors from within that most affect SUNY Cortland include the composition of the student body and faculty, its administrative and governance structures (and how those structures interact), and its relationship with the various bargaining units as well as with the Auxiliary Services Corporation (ASC). What follows is a description of these factors, an analysis of their impact on the College’s overall campus climate and in particular its morale, and specific recommendations for change.

Enrollment Trends and Student Composition

Information regarding college enrollment over time is described Chapter 4, with overall enrollment increasing steadily since 1996 to an all-time high in Fall 2001. Enrollment data for Fall 2001 also indicate that 60% of the College’s students were enrolled in a professional studies program in 2001 compared to 30% in arts and sciences, with remaining students classified as pre-majors. In fact, since 1993 the percentage of professional studies majors has been increasing in general, peaking at 64% in Fall 2000, and arts and sciences majors decreasing. Figure 12 shows these changes from 1997 to 2001.
Summary statistics for incoming full-time students over the past four academic years are presented in Table 14, showing a steady increase in first-time students. Numbers of new transfer students during that time have stayed relatively consistent, except for a drop in Fall 2000 due to an early admissions closing for transfers resulting from an extremely high freshmen yield. As described in Chapter 2, the College’s enrollment success has resulted in increasingly more selective admissions, with new students showing a better academic profile the last few years.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 1997</th>
<th>Fall 1998</th>
<th>Fall 1999</th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Time Students</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>1256</td>
<td>1195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Students</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the most part, students who attend SUNY Cortland are New York State residents, with only 1-2% of each entering class from outside the state. Also, around 55% of students live on campus, a figure that has stayed fairly stable over the years, and the student population is predominately Caucasian, an issue that is addressed thoroughly in Chapter 10. There was a significant change from Fall 1999 to Fall 2000 in the proportion of new students aged 25 and over, with that figure doubling from 9% to 18% and the average age of new students increasing from 21 to 23 years. With respect to degrees granted, around 1100 undergraduate students and slightly fewer than 300 graduate students have received their degrees every year since 1997. For undergraduates, the six-year graduation rate decreased from 64% in 1999-2000 to 57% in 2000-01 (for 1994 and 1995 cohorts, respectively).

Instructive information about SUNY Cortland students comes from the College Student Inventory (CSI), administered annually as part of the College’s first-year experience course, COR 101. As the table in Appendix J shows, Cortland students’ average CSI scores differ markedly from national averages in a number of areas. Overall,
these students score above average in sociability and leadership, but below average in intellectual interest, social enrichment, and openness. Additionally, there are indications that SUNY Cortland students will need more support services based on measures of dropout proneness, predicted academic difficulty, and study habits, but will be less likely to seek such assistance, as revealed through measures of receptivity to institutional help and attitudes toward educators. It is important to remember that, despite these characteristics, Cortland students are more than capable academically as indicated through high school GPA and SAT scores.

Insight into SUNY Cortland students is also gained through an examination of judicial violations, with the figure in Appendix K summarizing these violations from 1996-97 to 1999-2000. Although total violations remained about the same over that period of time (e.g., 2,852 in 1998-99 and 2,855 in 1999-2000), clear increases have occurred in alcohol policy violations, corresponding closely to overall student FTE. Other frequent violations pertain to the noise policy, alcohol guidelines, and abuse of the judicial system. Violations of state and local law and physical assaults have increased over time, with decreases occurring in violations of drug policy, harassment, and of the noise policy.

Faculty Composition

Chapter 5 provides a detailed description of how dramatically the composition of SUNY Cortland faculty has changed in the past five years. Because this factor is so key to the institution’s internal context, however, it bears repeating that the College has experienced more than a 50% turnover in full-time, tenure-track faculty during that time, making the overall faculty composition younger and more ethnically diverse. In addition, compared to the past newer faculty are more likely to have been hired in professional studies as opposed to arts and sciences.

Faculty Governance and Administration

As outlined in the current *College Handbook* the SUNY Cortland faculty has the primary responsibility for the conduct of the College’s instruction, research, and service programs. The Faculty Senate maintains four standing policy committees that address issues related to educational policy, faculty personnel policies and welfare, student policies and procedures, and long range planning. The Senate also maintains a Committee on Committees, a College Research Committee, and a College Curriculum Review Committee, a General Education Committee, and a Course Teacher Evaluation Committee.

During the 1998-99 academic year the Faculty Senate endorsed the *Handbook for Part-Time Academics and Professionals*, modified the Committee on Teaching Effectiveness, accepted a report from the ad hoc Committee on
Advisement, and created a Policy on Harassment and Violence. The 1999-2000 academic year was marked primarily by discussions concerning the College’s General Education Program, as well as acceptance of a new Advisement Mission Statement, endorsement of e-mail policies, and acceptance of a policy related to transfer students and Greek organizations. Discussions were also held concerning the process for determining discretionary salary increases for faculty and professional staff.

The College’s administration is led by the president, whose closest advisory group is the President’s Cabinet, the four vice presidents and the executive assistant to the president. There is also a President’s Council, which consists of the President’s Cabinet, four associate vice presidents, and two academic deans. A larger group, the Administrative Conference, consists of the President’s Council, academic department chairs and program heads, and unit directors.

Collective Bargaining Agencies

Almost all SUNY Cortland employees are represented by collective bargaining agencies. Unions represented on campus include: The Civil Service Employee Association (CSEA), the United University Professions (UUP), the Public Employees Federation (PEF), Council 82, the New York State Corrections Officers Police Benevolent Association (NYSCOPBA), and the Graduate Student Employee Union (GSEU). The UUP represents the largest number of Cortland employees, including full-time and part-time academic faculty, professional staff, and librarians. UUP contract negotiations take place at the state level, and negotiations during 1996 – 99 were unusually long, with employees working without an active contract for a period of three years. The result was no salary raises for three years, a situation that exacerbated the fact that SUNY Cortland faculty salaries are low compared both to national standards and to those at other SUNY university colleges (see Table 15). The most recent contract negotiations were more timely, and UUP members are currently in the third year of a four-year contract. As other examples of UUP activities, this organization has established a scholarship program for SUNY students and has created programs for improving the retention of ethnic and female faculty. UUP provides competitive awards for faculty development, sponsors an annual lecture series, and regularly publishes a campus newsletter. Dependents of UUP members are eligible for tuition assistance.
Table 15
SUNY Cortland Faculty Salaries Compared to National and SUNY University College Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Public Comprehensive Institutions</th>
<th>SUNY University Colleges</th>
<th>SUNY Cortland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>$68,828</td>
<td>$64,725</td>
<td>$62,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>$54,886</td>
<td>$53,108</td>
<td>$49,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>$45,147</td>
<td>$43,633</td>
<td>$40,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Data obtained from 4/20/01 Chronicle of Higher Education

Other college bargaining units serve contractual functions similar to those of UUP, and most have active programs in place to benefit employees (e.g., employee assistance programs). An especially significant recent development was the unionization of Auxiliary Services Corporation employees in 2000, with these individuals now represented by CSEA.

Auxiliary Services Corporation

The Auxiliary Services Corporation (ASC) is a private, not-for-profit organization operating campus dining facilities, the campus bookstore, and other services including vending, photocopying, and the SUNYCard program. ASC also owns and manages the Antlers facility at the Raquette Lake Outdoor Educational Center, across the lake from Camp Huntington. ASC operates according to five-year contracts with the College, and is currently in the fourth year of its latest negotiated contract.

Over the years ASC has contributed substantially to the life of the College, in both direct and subtle ways. Examples include its campus grants program, which provides well over $100,000 each year to organizations and offices such as the Campus Arts and Lecture Series, multicultural affairs, the Center for Multicultural and Gender Studies, and admissions. In 1998 ASC made a $1,000,000 pledge to the Cortland College Foundation, payable over a seven-year period, which has funded student scholarships among other worthwhile initiatives. Perhaps most notably, in 2000 ASC negotiated a contract with Coca Cola that will bring close to $1 million to the College over the next ten years. For 2000-01, $300,000 from this agreement was allocated for the following purposes: CURE scholarships ($170,000), faculty development ($50,000), stadium start-up costs ($50,000), student affairs ($15,000), and athletics/recreational sports ($15,000).
Analysis

Enrollment Trends and Student and Faculty Composition

The significant enrollment increase over the past five years, though beneficial in many ways, has also produced a number of problems for the College, both with respect to academics and student life. An important and deleterious effect for academic affairs resulted from the forced hiring of many adjunct professors for 2000-01 to cover the influx of students, making the College lose ground in its attempts to reach an 80:20 ratio in courses taught by full-time faculty. Specifically, after reaching a high of 71% in Fall 1999, the institution saw this figure fall to 67% in Fall 2001. To address this issue, two years ago the College began converting part-time lines to full-time, non-tenure track positions, as described in Chapter 5. To this point, 23 positions have been converted in this way, which should help the College meet its 80:20 goal as well as provide more stability in the teaching faculty. Perhaps reflecting this action, the College’s ratio of full-time faculty to undergraduate students remains reasonable, with this figure estimated to be 20.2 in 2001-02 compared to a SUNY university college average of 19.8 (range = 15.7 to 24.3).

Student life concerns resulting from the enrollment overflow primarily involve over-crowding in campus housing. For 2001-02 Residential Services was forced to triple 263 students, the highest number in many years. The College also altered its housing policy significantly in Fall 2001, for the first time stating in admissions materials that it would no longer guarantee incoming students on-campus housing during their time at SUNY Cortland. In addition, in 1999 the College took ownership of a 15-building off-campus apartment complex that houses 240 students, and invested in a new parking lot to help accommodate the increase in vehicles on campus. Finally, a priority for the next construction cycle is a new residence hall.

To summarize, the College has responded to numerous challenges resulting from recent enrollment increases in a responsible and effective manner. In part, this response was facilitated by the fact that the College’s long range planning goals were modified in 2000 to include “Develop a plan for accommodating enrollment growth” as a priority goal, complete with actions such as developing an optimal enrollment target and mix and planning for sufficient residence hall occupancy. It is also important to note that, as detailed in Chapter 4, SUNY Cortland has achieved its enrollment objective as agreed with System Administration in the MOU three years ahead of schedule. As a result, the College is entering a period of steady-state enrollment, making it much easier to plan and provide needed courses and support services. A possible complicating factor in this respect is an unexpectedly high number
of graduate students who enrolled on at least a part-time basis for Fall 2001. This situation may mean that the College has to adjust its enrollment targets for future years.

Closely related to the enrollment issue is the growing differential between the proportion of students enrolled in professional studies programs compared to the school of arts and sciences. SUNY Cortland has committed in its MOU with System Administration to reduce the present 64% to 32% differential to 60% enrolled in professional studies and 40% in arts and sciences by 2005. Undoubtedly, the College made a strong move toward achieving this objective in 2000 when it obtained the $1.75 million Title III grant, which is focused almost exclusively on this goal. With only one full year of the grant completed, it is too soon to determine how effective its strategies will be, but there was a drop from Fall 2000 to Fall 2001 in percentage of new students in professional studies programs, from 62% to 52%, and an increase in percentage of pre-majors, from 7% to 22%. Since the Title III strategy relies heavily on converting pre-majors to the arts and sciences, these changes are certainly a step in the right direction.

Changes in the composition of SUNY Cortland students and faculty have also required the College to adapt in many ways, some extremely positive and others less so. Chapter 11 details the initiatives undertaken to accommodate the increase in higher academic ability students, including expansion of the Honors Program and the institution of Scholars’ Day, as well as the College’s recent attempts to enhance its faculty development program. By comparison, little systematic action has been taken across the institution to address the fact that SUNY Cortland students, despite being quite academically capable, deviate from national norms in ways that might well place them at risk in terms of educational success (i.e., as revealed through the CSI data).

Behavior problems exhibited by students have primarily been addressed through the work of the Judicial Affairs Office, which has taken numerous actions the past several years such as revising the Code of Student Conduct, publishing monthly judicial violation statistics via e-mail, holding presentations in residence halls, and increasing faculty involvement in the student judicial process. It is probably too soon to determine the effectiveness of these efforts and, as described earlier, there have been steady increases in violations of state and local law and physical assaults. At the same time, violations of drug policy and incidents of harassment have declined. It is also encouraging that the 2000-01 judicial affairs annual report states that there was a 10% decrease in repeat offenders compared to the previous year, suggesting that enhanced judicial programs and processes are having an impact.
Faculty Governance and Administration

Although the Faculty Senate remains influential in campus operations, there have been recurring problems soliciting participation, with the most recent elections for Senate offices having only one person run for each office. Similarly, some Senate committees are unable to function because of lack of membership. To begin to address this issue, recent modifications were made to the standing meeting procedures to make the meetings more efficient and productive. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee is also developing a document clarifying a senator’s role, and has begun to regularly distribute an action item list delineating the status of all active items. In 2000-01 President Taylor designated participation in the Faculty Senate as a factor for special consideration in the discretionary salary increase (DSI) process.

Administrators, from the director and department chair level up through management/confidential (M/C) employees, play a vital role in directing the day-to-day operations of the campus. In order to assess how administrators on campus perceive their work environment, the Middle States Steering Committee surveyed all members of the Administrative Council in Spring 2001. Overall, 25 of the 36 (69%) campus administrators responding indicated that most of the time they were unable to discharge their duties effectively due to time constraints. They also reported an increase in the volume of paperwork and the number of meetings they are required to attend within the last five years. Suggestions for change included reallocation of responsibilities as well as providing additional staff support. A positive outcome was that most respondents (83.4%) indicated that other offices across campus were generally helpful when asked for assistance.

In one key area, a clear difference existed between M/C employees and unit directors compared to other administrators such as department chairs and program coordinators. Specifically, while M/C’s and directors take advantage of professional development opportunities by attending off-campus workshops and conferences (with a mean response of 3.6 out of 5, with higher scores indicating participation in more professional development opportunities), individuals at other administrative levels indicated they did so to a much lesser degree (with a mean response of 1.9). Reasons for this lack of participation included a lack of awareness of these opportunities or lack of funding to support them. Department chairs, over half of whom have been in the position for only a few years, suggested the need for more in-service training and orientation, especially in the areas of staff supervision, budgeting, and other aspects of human resources.
Another source of information is derived from evaluations of M/C employees, whose performance is reviewed annually by their immediate supervisor. Through this process, surveys are distributed to a subset of up to 25 individuals identified by M/C employees in consultation with their supervisor, with a condition being that evaluators must include those persons who work most closely with the person being evaluated. The survey consists of a number of quantitative ratings on a scale from 0 to 4 (with higher ratings reflecting more positive responses), with the questions tapping such characteristics as understanding the mission of the College, leadership, communication, planning and organization, and overall quality of work. Respondents, who remain anonymous, are also encouraged to provide specific examples of strengths and weaknesses for those being evaluated. Composite data over the past four years indicate a high degree of stability in average responses during that time as well as a relatively high degree of overall satisfaction with the College’s administrative staff. Specifically, from 1998 to 2001 average scores for all individual items ranged from 2.90 to 3.59, and the overall evaluation means for the four years were 3.25, 3.36, 3.41, and 3.45, respectively.

A final observation about governance and administrative structures at SUNY Cortland involves the close working relationship that has existed over the years between the Faculty Senate and SUNY Cortland administration. All members of the President’s Cabinet regularly attend Faculty Senate meetings and provide reports on issues of interest and answer questions from Senate members. In addition, the president, provost, and executive assistant to the president attend all Faculty Senate Steering Committee meetings, ensuring ongoing and frequent communication.

Collective Bargaining Agencies and Auxiliary Services Corporation

The impact of the various collective bargaining organizations on campus functioning is significant and generally positive, although systematic evaluation of this impact has not taken place. Clearly, having a contract in place enhances the perception of job stability, which is not only an issue for existing employees but also helps the College attract and recruit qualified faculty and staff. Contracts also affect job satisfaction through securing benefits and providing professional development opportunities. The local union chapters, especially UUP and CSEA, contribute positively to the life of the campus through sponsorship of professional and social events. UUP and CSEA are also represented on the Faculty Senate.

Considerable evaluative information exists with respect to perceptions of ASC across campus. For instance, ASC’s dining facilities are assessed each semester through customer satisfaction surveys, using a scale from 1 (low
satisfaction) to 10 (high satisfaction). Data collected since Fall of 1997 indicate relatively consistent results, with the ASC dining plans receiving average scores of 6.4 to 6.8 and its dining facilities receiving average ratings from 7.5 to 8.0. The SOS also provides relevant information on students’ satisfaction with campus food service, with SUNY Cortland ranked fourth out of the 13 university colleges in both 1997 and 2000. Similarly, the campus bookstore was rated fourth in 1997, but this ranking fell to seventh in 2000. Overall, these findings – as well as the contributions of ASC to the campus community described earlier – indicate that the College enjoys a highly beneficial relationship with ASC. Especially in the past five years, ASC has provided the campus with significant financial support enabling the College to better meet its priority goals. Also during that time, this organization has demonstrated a willingness to alter its services to better meet student needs, such as pre-packaging book orders and building a food court in the student union. Finally, ASC’s survey data demonstrate that this organization is able to maintain a consistently high level of service that is perceived positively by students.

Campus Morale

The present chapter documents that SUNY Cortland has experienced a number of dramatic changes over the last few years in internal working conditions, some of which would be expected to exert considerable influence on the campus climate overall and, in particular, the morale of faculty and staff members. The Middle States questionnaire to department chairpersons specifically asked respondents to characterize morale in their department. Of the 21 chairpersons who responded, twelve indicated that the level of faculty morale was "good" or "very good" in their departments, while four reported "marginal" levels and five reported "poor" or "very poor" levels. When asked to assess whether campus morale had changed significantly over the past five years, 14 department chairs felt that morale had improved, four believed that morale levels were about the same, and three indicated they had declined during this time period.

Those chairpersons reporting that morale had improved most frequently cited the following factors: The addition of energetic young faculty, the College’s attempts to address salary compression through DSI procedures, increased student enrollment in degree programs and the addition of new degree programs, the College’s conversion of part-time faculty lines to full-time status, perceptions of more effective leadership (particularly in the School of Professional Studies), having an active contract with the state, and greater recognition of teacher education programs campus-wide. Factors specified as inhibiting morale included the ongoing problem of low salaries relative to peer institutions, the College’s salary compression problem, perceptions of teaching loads between schools as inequitable
(with this load generally viewed as higher in professional studies), and the view that administrators are too isolated from the faculty and make decisions based primarily on fiscal concerns. Other reasons offered were increases in student enrollment without concomitant increases in resources, too much emphasis on assessment, the perception that student abilities have declined over the past five years, and mandates imposed by the SUNY Board of Trustees (e.g., those affecting campus general education programs).

Other assessments of campus morale include the 1998-1999 Higher Education Research Institute's (HERI) survey of 103 full-time Cortland faculty. Survey results indicated the vast majority of respondents felt very satisfied or satisfied with working conditions and professional relations with other faculty, and they expressed overall satisfaction with their jobs. Ratings on each of these items in fact exceeded the national average. The HERI survey also included responses from six academic administrators and, compared to national averages, these individuals expressed similar levels of overall job satisfaction, higher levels of satisfaction with professional relations with faculty and other administrators, and lower levels of satisfaction with working conditions. For additional findings, most faculty and administrators in the HERI sample agreed that women faculty members and faculty of color are treated fairly at SUNY Cortland. Also, they cited time pressures and excessively bureaucratic institutional procedures as having the most negative impact on morale.

Compared to full-time faculty, less is known regarding the morale of other employee groups at the College. For instance, no formal assessment of full-time professional staff members’ morale has been conducted since the 1997 Middle States Periodic Review Report. As described in Chapter 5, a survey conducted in 2000 of 63 part-time faculty and 10 part-time professional staff members indicated moderately positive responses in their opinions of the College. Many respondents, however, expressed the desire to have more part-time lines converted to full-time lines, and raised concerns over low salaries, poor benefits, and perceived pressure to take on more responsibilities than are included in their contract or performance program. Also, while they felt the College was highly committed to the needs of students, many respondents reported feeling that the College was not committed to their work efforts.

With respect to classified staff, a 1998 CSEA survey revealed that 91% of CSEA employees believed a morale problem existed in their area. Further, only 36% reported a great deal of job satisfaction and only 20% believed improvements in morale would occur in the near future. It should be noted that this assessment took place prior to the resolution of protracted contract negotiations, and further surveys since that time have not been conducted.
To summarize, the morale of the College’s full-time faculty seems reasonably robust, based on department chairpersons’ perceptions and the HERI survey. The chairpersons’ input also suggests that morale has generally increased in their departments since the 1997 Middle States Periodic Review Report was prepared. SUNY Cortland has taken several actions intended to improve working conditions, especially those related in salary. Since 1997 the College has committed a proportion of available DSI funds each year to the salary inequity problem, allocating 39% of these funds (for a total of $61,566) in 1997, 45% (for a total of $76,214) in 1998, and 100% (for a total of $204,143) in 1999. In 2000, only $15,000 was used for salary inequity corrections so that most DSI funds could be used to reward meritorious performance, but in 2001 President Taylor used 47% of available DSI monies, or $100,576, to make inequity corrections.

A Part-Time Labor/Management Concerns Committee has been established to monitor working conditions for this group, with major activities described in some detail in Chapter 5. Opportunities for faculty development have increased significantly, with the formation of the Faculty Development Committee and the commitment of $17,000 in 2000-01 and $27,000 in 2001-02 to this group through the College’s long range planning process. Certainly the Title III grant is a boon to faculty development, especially those in the arts and sciences who are receiving stipends to develop new curriculum programs and to participate in training workshops on advisement, technology, the development of learning communities, and using the College’s outdoor education facilities in their teaching.

One issue that still requires attention is the perceived workload discrepancies between schools. As explained in Chapter 3, those workload discrepancies that do exist are not between schools as much as they are between departments, both within and between schools. Regardless of the particular comparisons being made, however, disproportionate workloads are not beneficial to the institution or its faculty. As such, a comprehensive study of faculty workload at the College would seem in order.

Summary and Recommendations

The present chapter indicates that the internal character of SUNY Cortland has changed markedly in a number of important ways in the last five years, with more students, different kinds of students, and more full-time faculty who differ from their predecessors in several respects. Other internal conditions have remained more stable, notably the College’s governance and administrative structures, campus perceptions of the administration’s effectiveness, and continued beneficial working relationships between the administration and the Faculty Senate, the various
collective bargaining agencies, and ASC. On the basis of this evaluation, the following actions should be implemented with respect to internal contextual factors affecting the institution:

1. The provost should establish a standing committee charged with making recommendations to the president regarding an optimal enrollment and enrollment mix, taking into account factors such as number of faculty, workload, campus safety, housing, and campus morale.

2. The provost should establish a task force to analyze faculty workload across departments and schools and make recommendations where appropriate for addressing problem areas, with findings made public and opportunities provided for campus-wide discussion.

3. The College, working through appropriate faculty committees, should develop teaching strategies targeted at the characteristics that place SUNY Cortland students at academic risk, and encourage the widespread use of these strategies.

4. The College should regularly conduct surveys of employee morale as part of its overall assessment plan, being sure to include all employee groups.

5. The Faculty Senate should survey faculty and staff as to reasons why they do or do not participate in the Senate, then use the results to develop appropriate strategies for increasing participation.

6. The College should enhance professional development opportunities for department chairs and program coordinators through annual orientation sessions on topics including budgeting, supervision and human resources, and increase awareness of and support for attendance at administrative workshops and conferences.
EXTERNAL INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

CHAPTER 14

Description

Introduction

As a public, state-supported institution of higher education, SUNY Cortland has multiple external stakeholders to whom it is accountable. These include groups within New York State such as the SUNY Board of Trustees, SUNY System Administration, the New York State Education Department, and state government. The College is also accountable to a number of accrediting bodies, including the Middle States Association’s Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE), the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and many department-specific organizations. Other external constituents are the College’s local statutory governing body, referred to as the College Council, and the local community. Finally, increased competition for students, especially those of high academic ability, has exerted significant impact on SUNY Cortland and its operations in recent years and therefore requires attention and analysis.

State of New York

SUNY. As one of 64 institutions in the SUNY system, SUNY Cortland is ultimately responsible to the State University with respect to its operations. SUNY is governed by a Board of Trustees (BOT) consisting of 16 members, 15 of whom are appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the state senate and one who serves as president of the SUNY student assembly. All BOT members except for the student assembly representative serve 10-year terms. The State University of New York Policies of the Board of Trustees is published on an annual basis, and includes policies and procedures institutions must adhere to with respect to campus governance, the appointment and evaluation of faculty and staff, and other related issues.

Article 8, Section 355 of the New York State Education Law contains a detailed description of the BOT’s membership, duties, and privileges. This document does not, however, delineate standards BOT members should meet to be considered for appointment, nor does it specify methods or criteria for evaluating trustees or holding them accountable. Major powers include the following: 1) to appoint the chancellor and System Administration senior staff; 2) to appoint campus presidents; 3) to grant all degrees; 4) to regulate admission of students; 5) to regulate tuition, fees, charges and curriculum; and, 6) to establish new campuses. The SUNY BOT also has relatively broad authority over curriculum across the State University, and has exerted significant influence in this
area at times. As one notable example, in 1998 the trustees passed a Resolution on General Education requiring a minimum of 30 hours course work in specific subject areas for all baccalaureate candidates.

While the trustees have statutory authority over SUNY campuses, there is little actual contact between this group and individual institutions. Instead, SUNY System Administration deals directly with campuses to manage and administer the business of the State University, with most interactions focusing on institutional mission, curriculum, and fiscal issues. As alluded to throughout this document, as part of System Administration’s Mission Review process SUNY Cortland signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that will have enormous impact on the direction and nature of the College’s activities over the next five years. Under the provisions of the MOU, SUNY Cortland agreed to the following major actions: 1) to stabilize overall enrollments; 2) to utilize greater selectivity in its acceptance of new students; 3) to achieve a 60:40 ratio in its enrollment of professional studies compared to arts and sciences majors; 4) to conduct annual surveys of its graduates and explore how to collect data systematically on employer satisfaction with these graduates; 5) to achieve NCATE accreditation by 2003; 6) to increase the percentage of courses taught by full-time faculty to 80% by 2004; and, 7) to increase its total sponsored funding (direct and indirect) from $1.4 million to $4 million by 2005.

System Administration also plays a critical role with respect to curriculum on individual campuses, as its Academic Planning, Policy, and Evaluation office must review, evaluate, and approve plans and resources for all new curricula across the system. Recently, System Administration has inserted itself increasingly into areas related to the quality of campus-based general education and teacher education programs, at least in part due to concerns voiced by the SUNY BOT about these programs.

To illustrate, in response to the 1998 BOT Resolution on General Education described earlier, the SUNY Provost’s Advisory Task Force on General Education was created in 1999 and charged with interpreting and implementing this resolution. In its final report, this group outlined twelve learning outcomes to be included in all SUNY general education programs. It also recommended a process for campuses to follow in reviewing their programs and submitting plans to System Administration demonstrating these outcomes were adequately incorporated into their general education curriculum. During 1999-2000 campuses were required to engage in this process, submitting their plans to the Provost’s Advisory Council on General Education (PACGE), formed especially for that purpose. SUNY Cortland’s plan was approved in November 2000.
In the area of teacher education, System Administration approved a new action agenda in June 2001 that sets new standards for institutions with teacher preparation programs. One example is a requirement that students in these programs must complete not less than 100 hours of clinical experience in a school classroom before and exclusive of time spent student teaching. This requirement applies to all teacher preparation students entering the College in Fall 2001.

System Administration’s involvement in assessment has also been extensive in recent years, evidenced in the SUNY Assessment Initiative that focuses on student learning outcomes described in Chapter 3. This initiative is based on a report prepared by the SUNY Provost’s Advisory Task Force on the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes in 2000. Under the provisions of this initiative, individual campuses must evaluate their general education programs every three years using the twelve learning outcomes delineated by the SUNY Provost’s Advisory Task Force on General Education in 1999. This initiative also calls eventually for system-wide assessment of general education programs as well as program review for all academic majors every five to seven years.

Perhaps no area of interaction between System Administration and individual campuses has been more contentious – or confusing – in recent years than the process through which campuses receive their operating funds. Until the 1980’s individual institutions had very little budgeting discretion, a situation that changed with the introduction of flexibility legislation. In 1992-93 controls over PS:R (personal service: regular) FTE were lifted, giving campuses full discretion in position FTE limits and distribution and allowing campuses to expand temporary service allocations to better reflect part-time instructional costs. Since that time System Administration has introduced three different budget iterations: The Resource Allocation Model (RAM) in 1998, the Budget Allocation Process (BAP) in 1999, and the Performance Based Budget Allocation (PBBA) process in 2000!

Under PBBA, campuses’ budget allocation is derived primarily from retention of tuition, state support for sponsored activity, research, and public service, and state support computed from a complex formula based on student enrollments. More specifically, this formula is calculated on a weighted three-year average of overall enrollment as well as a credit-hour analysis that classifies course enrollments by discipline and course level. Overall then, the amount of money allocated to campuses by the state depends on whether courses are designated as lower division, upper division, beginning graduate, or advanced graduate, with higher-level courses generally generating more funding, as well as by academic discipline. Some examples of high-cost courses (and, therefore, those that result in more funding to campuses) include upper division classes in biological sciences and fine/applied arts, while
low-cost courses include classes such as upper division education and lower and upper division psychology courses. Clearly, this classification scheme is not to the advantage of an institution like SUNY Cortland with its particular enrollment patterns.

**New York State Education Department.** The New York State Education Department (NYSED) is responsible for general supervision of all educational institutions in New York State, including SUNY institutions, and is overseen by a statewide Board of Regents. Although the State University is therefore ultimately accountable to NYSED, the influence of NYSED on individual SUNY campuses is manifested primarily through its policies and regulations with respect to teacher education, since it has statutory authority for teacher education curriculum and teacher certification. In September 1999 NYSED approved sweeping changes to Section 52.21 of the Regulations of the Commissioner of Education that made it necessary for campuses to significantly revise and re-register virtually all their undergraduate programs by March 2000 and graduate programs by March 2001. Having 59 teacher education programs made these tasks especially challenging for SUNY Cortland, and caused great stress to faculty members and administrators responsible for carrying them out.

Other revisions to Section 52.21 pose equally difficult challenges and have serious implications for the College’s resource base since they require increases in full-time faculty, especially in the area of student teacher supervision, limit the number of student teachers per supervisor to 18, and limit the number of credit hours faculty can teach per year to 24 for undergraduate courses, 18 for graduate courses, or 21 for a combination of undergraduate and graduate courses. This last change is particularly significant since at present many teacher education faculty teach 12 hours per semester. Another costly provision of Section 52.21 is the requirement that all teacher education programs be accredited by an outside agency by December 31, 2004. Partly as a result, SUNY Cortland decided in 1998 to pursue accreditation by NCATE.

**New York State government.** Although both the governor and state legislature have some formally defined responsibilities with respect to the State University (e.g., the appointment of trustees), the impact of government on SUNY is undoubtedly most realized through the state budgeting process. As described in Chapter 8, the governor and legislature rarely agree on a budget in time for the new fiscal year, with 2001 marking the seventeenth consecutive year a budget has not been passed on schedule. Such conditions clearly make it impossible for campuses to engage in sound, long-term fiscal planning.
Fortunately, SUNY Cortland has established positive relationships on a more immediate basis with local state legislators. In fact, the Cortland Coalition – a group consisting of college administrators, UUP officials, and Faculty Senate representatives among others – meets every year with these individuals for the purpose of discussing the College’s budgetary situation and needs, in an attempt to get those needs represented in the budget process for the following year.

Accrediting Bodies

Institutional accreditation. At present, SUNY Cortland is chiefly accountable as an institution to the Middle States Association’s Commission on Higher Education and NYSED. As described earlier, the College is in the process of pursuing accreditation by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), one of the nation’s largest accrediting bodies for teacher education. This process is extremely laborious and time-consuming, with the College required to meet nine preconditions before even being recognized as a candidate for accreditation. Preconditions include developing a conceptual framework expressing the College’s vision for teacher education and demonstrating that it regularly monitors and evaluates its programs’ quality, performance of candidates, and effectiveness of its graduates. SUNY Cortland has targeted Fall 2003 for its NCATE site visit, and continues to make progress in implementing NCATE standards. Understandably, the fact that the institution has been simultaneously undergoing re-registry by NYSED has resulted in heavy workloads and immense pressure for affected personnel.

Discipline- and unit-specific accreditation. In addition to meeting institution-wide accrediting standards, a number of academic departments and service units are accountable to their own certification bodies. For example, in its Middle States department questionnaire the Education Department identified six such bodies in addition to NCATE and the NYSED. Similarly, both the departments of recreation and leisure studies and sociology must meet the requirements of three different accrediting agencies for their various concentrations. Other units accredited by external organizations include student health services, the Counseling Center, and the Chemistry Department.

College Council

Under Article 8, Section 356 of the New York State Education Law all state-operated SUNY institutions are supervised locally by a college council, which consists of nine members appointed by the governor and a student member, usually the president of the campus student government. All members except the student serve staggered seven-year terms, and the governor appoints the chairperson. Article 8, Section 356 as well as SUNY Cortland’s
College Council’s own locally developed by-laws clearly delineate duties, responsibilities, and privileges of council members. Neither document, however, makes reference to desirable traits or necessary qualifications of these members, nor do they specify mechanisms for evaluating and holding them accountable.

Although it serves in an advisory capacity, the College Council is designed to promote the welfare of SUNY Cortland and its students. The Council meets five times annually to discuss the operations of the College. At each meeting, college administrators, the Faculty Senate chair, and the student government president give reports on their respective areas. Formal responsibilities for the council include reviewing all major plans of the institution, approving the institution’s budget request to the SUNY trustees, endorsing the president’s Annual Report, approving rules and regulations regarding student life, and overseeing the custody, care, and naming of buildings. According to the current College Council chair, responding to a survey administered as part of the Middle States reaccreditation process, the most important responsibility of the College Council is to search for, screen, and recommend candidates for the college presidency to the SUNY Board of Trustees and chancellor. The chair also indicated that he communicates regularly with the BOT chair and talks with him monthly on average regarding the College.

Throughout the years, SUNY Cortland has enjoyed a highly productive relationship with the College Council, which plays an active part in the life of the College. In addition to having its own committee structure in place for fulfilling its functions, the College Council is represented on college committees such as the Public Safety Advisory Committee, the Auxiliary Services Corporation Membership Board, and the Cortland Coalition. College Council members are regularly apprised of campus activities through the College Bulletin and the student newspaper, and are invited to major college events including the President’s Opening of School meeting, the Teaching and Learning Conference, Scholars’ Day, and Commencement. Each year the College Council also selects a local recipient of the College Community Appreciation Award, and a recognition dinner held in that person’s honor is widely attended by members of the Cortland community. Finally, a council member always accompanies SUNY Cortland’s delegation to Albany each April to SUNY Day, an event that allows college representatives – including administrators, faculty, and students – to meet with legislators and legislative aides to discuss issues of vital interest to the College, especially those related to the budget.

Cortland Community

As one might expect, the impact of the College on the greater Cortland community is enormous, and much effort goes into maintaining a cooperative and mutually beneficial relationship between SUNY Cortland and the
city. A study conducted by economics faculty in 1994-95 showed that the College contributed $124 million to the local economy, an impact that could increase exponentially upon completion of the new stadium. Already, two major statewide events are booked for this facility in 2002, the Empire State Games and the New York State Senior Games, each of which should draw thousands of participants and observers.

Almost as important as the College’s contributions to the local economy are the programs and services it provides to the community and region. In Fall 1999 SUNY Cortland received a $400,000 Community Outreach Partnership Centers grant to coordinate and improve social services in the area. The Center for Continuing Education (CCE) coordinates many of the events that bring the College and community together, such as the Business Showcase in which the College and Cortland County Chamber of Commerce work to highlight local business and industry. Last year 90 businesses participated in this event, with 5,000 people attending. Other CCE events include Elderhostel, a Women’s Leadership Conference (in collaboration with the YWCA and Zonta), and community roundtables that drew around 500 community members last year. There are also numerous opportunities for students to provide service to the city and region. According to information from the Cortland Student Volunteer Project (CSVP), during 2000-01 approximately 500 SUNY Cortland students served as volunteers to area organizations such as the YMCA, YWCA, Girl Scouts, Family Counseling Service, BOCES Literacy/GED/ESL programs, Zero Adolescent Pregnancy program, and to local schools. In addition, students participated in 300 internships throughout the community. By recently becoming a charter member in the newly formed New York Campus Compact, a consortium focused on service learning opportunities, the College will be in a position to place even more students into important roles in the community.

Some final points of intersection between the College and the community include President Taylor’s extensive involvement with the local business community, especially in his capacity as a member of the Cortland Business Network. Similarly, the vice president for finance and management is vice president of the Chamber of Commerce, and other administrators are active in groups like the Chamber and Rotary. In addition, as described in Chapter 7, the Cortland College Foundation and Alumni Board are major vehicles for communication exchanges between the College and the community.

Increased Competition for Students

A final external contextual factor to be discussed is the fact that the College has increasingly had to compete in recent years with other institutions for students, in particular those of high academic quality. Reflecting a decrease
of almost 60,000 high school graduates in New York State from the mid-1980’s to the mid-1990’s, SUNY Cortland experienced a steep drop in freshmen applications and enrollment during that time. The institution responded in 1995 by reorganizing and establishing a new enrollment management unit, which was given responsibility for improving admissions as well as increasing student retention rates, and infusing significant resources into it. Major actions taken by this unit and its demonstrated effectiveness are detailed in Chapter 4. As additional measures, the College overhauled the admissions’ publications including electronic media, reorganized some academic majors such as business economics and social philosophy, and created new majors like athletic training, human services, sport management, musical theater, special education, and a Master’s of Science in Teaching in Elementary Education. The College also spent $1.03 million to refurbish the lobby of Miller Building in order to create a more attractive Admissions Office. As a result of these efforts, for Fall 2000 and Fall 2001 the College finally achieved steady-state enrollment and enrollment stability. In fact, by achieving a total headcount of 7,226 in Fall 2000, SUNY Cortland exceeded the target of 7,218 established in the MOU with System Administration four years early.

The pressure to increase and maintain enrollments has been accompanied by heightened attempts to attract high academic ability students. These efforts result in part because of motivators internal to the institution, notably its desire to continuously improve the intellectual climate on campus. It is also the case, however, that SUNY System Administration expects four-year campuses to become more selective in their admissions standards. To illustrate, as part of the Mission Review process SUNY Cortland was asked in its MOU with System Administration to decrease its applicant acceptance rate and raise the profile of its admits based on high school averages and SAT scores. These actions are consistent with existing initiatives at the College, which in 1996 placed foremost priority on the establishment of scholarships as a means of attracting better students. Through its Office of Institutional Advancement, the College created and awarded 755 new merit-based scholarships from 1999-2001, and has increased its scholarship program from $95,000 in 1995 to approximately $750,000 annually.

Analysis

Unfunded Mandates

One unmistakable conclusion from the above description is that SUNY Cortland finds itself in an unenviable situation, having to meet mandate after mandate while at the same time continuing to provide ongoing programs and services. Consider the following list of actions the College has completed or must undertake as a result of conditions imposed almost simultaneously by the SUNY Board of Trustees, System Administration, and NYSED:
1) implementation of new General Education Program; 2) execution of all MOU agreements; 3) revision and re-
registry of all teacher education programs, both undergraduate and graduate; 4) implementation of learning
outcomes-based assessment program for general education and all major programs; 5) adherence to other teacher
education conditions prescribed by System Administration and NYSED (e.g., limits on number of credit hours
faculty can teach); and, 6) achievement of NCATE accreditation. At a more specific level, the College’s NCATE
and re-registry coordinator reports that to this point the campus has developed 36 new undergraduate courses and 68
new graduates courses for NCATE and NYSED. It is hardly surprising, then, that Middle States questionnaires
filled out by department chairpersons revealed that these activities have taken a tremendous toll on faculty.

It is also critical to note that these conditions are “unfunded mandates” in the truest sense: Not one new dollar
has been allocated to support their implementation. Careful analysis has been done in order to estimate the
resources needed to implement the various mandates, and the results are daunting. According to the College’s vice
president for finance and management, the cost of meeting NCATE standards alone will approach $667,000 through
2003, and the College’s NCATE and re-registry coordinator reports that the 1999-2004 administrative budget for the
NCATE and NYSED processes is by itself $365,957. Further, the new General Education Program requires at least
the hiring of four new full-time faculty to teach foreign language and history, at a cost of $150,000 per year.

As a final observation, while it can be argued that these conditions imposed by the SUNY trustees, System
Administration, and NYSED place all public institutions in New York at risk, a good case can be made that SUNY
Cortland is uniquely disadvantaged. A primary reason is its large number of teacher preparation programs. An
additional factor is the over 50% turnover in full-time faculty, with a high proportion of new faculty being hired in
teacher preparation programs. As a result, much of the responsibility for enacting all the changes required for these
programs has fallen on the College’s most junior faculty, who are also struggling to establish themselves as good
teachers and productive scholars. Finally, as described immediately below, System Administration’s newest budget
system has made it especially difficult for SUNY Cortland to generate the resources to fund all these efforts.

PBBA and the Search for Alternate Funding Sources

The brief description contained earlier made it clear that PBBA’s enrollment funding punishes SUNY Cortland
because most students at the College are enrolled in courses considered “low-cost” in the PBBA scheme. Further,
PBBA has no distinct category for physical education, so these courses (excluding activities courses) are lumped
into the education category, clearly a concern for an institution that has approximately 1,200 physical education
majors! Other problems result from the fact that a large number of courses, including those in communication studies and physical education activities, fall into the “Other” category under PBBA, which are all considered low-cost. Also, all social science courses with the exception of psychology are considered as belonging in one general category. Finally, SUNY Cortland’s high proportion of freshmen the last few years negatively skew enrollment funding under PBBA, since lower division courses generally receive 10% less support than upper division courses.

Table 16 below shows the College’s projections for PBBA enrollment funding for 2001-02. In particular, this table aggregates expected course enrollments classified by cost and by level.

Table 16
Projected PBBA Course Enrollments by Cost and Level, 2001-02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Level</th>
<th>Low-Cost</th>
<th>Medium-Cost</th>
<th>High-Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>19.43%</td>
<td>20.12%</td>
<td>11.74%</td>
<td>51.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10.66%</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
<td>39.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate 1</td>
<td>6.86%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>.67%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate 2</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table clearly demonstrates the problems posed by the PBBA formula for SUNY Cortland, showing an almost perfect, inverse correlation between course enrollment and funding level.

The fact that PBBA is almost exclusively FTE-based also places the College at a funding disadvantage in that it does not take into account special program or physical plant needs. Prime examples include the Outdoor Education Center at Raquette Lake and the College’s large athletics program, both of which are integral to SUNY Cortland’s mission but do not generate much FTE. According to the vice president for finance and management, the College spends approximately $500,000 annually to operate the Outdoor Education Center, or the equivalent of more than 10 full-time faculty positions.

SUNY Cortland has made several concerted efforts to counter the negative impact of PBBA, including repeated appeals to System Administration to re-evaluate its system of classifying courses by cost. Interestingly, the new teacher education mandates should strengthen the College’s case that upper-division education courses are in no way low in cost. In addition, the College’s method of classifying its own courses may have added to its problems. As just one example, many programs offer statistics or computer courses and label them specific to their discipline.
Such courses, however, appear to meet the PBBA criteria for math/computer science classes and could therefore be included legitimately in a higher-cost category. Review and reclassification of courses might help SUNY Cortland improve its funding condition under PBBA. Another strategy is to seek creative ways of increasing FTE’s generated by special, expensive-to-maintain programs. In fact, the $1.75 million Title III grant obtained by the College in 1999 includes increasing FTE produced at the Outdoor Education Center as a primary goal.

In this regard, SUNY Cortland has focused significant time and energy on identifying and accessing alternate funding sources in the last five years. Most notable in this respect are the activities directed by the Office of Institutional Advancement, established in 1996. Described in detail in Chapter 7, this office’s success to date has been remarkable, more than tripling annual giving from $609,000 in 1996 to almost $1.9 million in 1999 and reaching the $2 million plateau in 2000. As a result, SUNY Cortland moved from 11th to 5th place among SUNY university colleges in fund-raising from 1995 to 2000. Until recently, the College was in the silent phase of its first capital campaign, with the intention of raising $10 million. The public goal announcement for this campaign was made in November 2001. Another example of alternate funding was the College’s successful negotiation through the Auxiliary Services Corporation with Coca-Cola in 2000. Chapter 13 contains a description of this arrangement and its financial implications for the campus.

Relationships with College Council and Community

An analysis of SUNY Cortland’s interactions with more local constituents like the College Council and the Cortland community reveals relationships that are positive and mutually beneficial for the most part. The description of College Council activities demonstrates that this group understands, accepts, and faithfully observes its responsibilities toward the College. As just one example, there are almost always enough Council members present for a quorum despite the fact that most Council members live outside the Cortland area. The Council was also active in recruiting and recommending Dr. Judson H. Taylor for president, and is supportive of policy recommendations as they relate to student conduct. To illustrate, in 2000 this group endorsed the administration’s proposal to prohibit students from joining any groups permanently banned by the College, in an attempt to control several “rogue fraternities” that have arisen in the community. According to the College Council chair in a Middle States questionnaire he completed, communication between the Council and President Taylor is good, and the chair also reported talking with President Taylor on a regular basis.
Similarly, the College has managed to establish and maintain good relationships with the local community. In addition to the role the College plays in the region with respect to economic impact and providing programs and services, SUNY Cortland and the City of Cortland have collaborated on a number of initiatives to bring about positive change. As an example, in 1999 President Taylor worked closely with city officials to develop a legal strategy for ending the Clayton Avenue Block Party, a raucous and destructive event hosted each spring by off-campus SUNY Cortland students and attended by thousands of students, many from outside the Cortland area.

Summary and Recommendations

The information in the present chapter clearly supports the conclusion that, like all institutions of higher education, SUNY Cortland must deal constantly and intensely to meet the requirements and needs of multiple constituent groups. In addition, the nature and juxtaposition of the demands posed by the SUNY Board of Trustees, System Administration, and the NYSED presently place constraints on the College that are more severe compared to other institutions. Overall, it would appear that SUNY Cortland is dealing with these challenges in an adequate fashion, managing to meet all conditions to this point while at the same time offering expected programs and services as well as exceeding expectations with respect to attracting and retaining higher-quality students.

On the basis of this evaluation, the College should implement the following actions with respect to external contextual factors affecting the institution:

1. Develop a task force of administrators and faculty to carefully examine the classification of all programs and courses so that the College can maximize funding via the PBBA formula.

2. Target special programs that do not generate large FTE’s but are critical to the College’s mission for creative and alternate funding solutions.

3. Keep enrollment management at the forefront in order to maximize overall student recruitment and retention, and to maximize enrollment in under-enrolled programs and courses that are categorized as high-cost under the PBBA formula.

4. Seek innovative incentives to encourage and reward faculty and staff members who are instrumental in the implementation of activities critical to the College’s future (e.g., NCATE accreditation).

5. Continue to foster positive and mutually beneficial relations with the College Council, the Cortland community, alumni, and local legislators, and use these relationships to promote SUNY Cortland at the state and System Administration levels.
History, Goals and Objectives, and Modes of Assessment

The College’s 1992 institutional self-study for Middle States identified the development of a Comprehensive Master Plan as an important objective for managing and enhancing the campus’ physical resources. In 1996 the Master Plan Update was completed, delineating the College’s primary goals and objectives with respect to physical infrastructure. The importance of this document was reflected in the College’s 1998-99 long range plan, which included the following as one of twelve planning goals: “To implement long-range maintenance, rehabilitation, and replacement of physical facilities, following the guide of the Master Plan.” Within this framework the College’s Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with System Administration specifically identified the following high priority actions: 1) finding an adequate and appropriate home for the large Education Department; 2) procuring capital funds for repair and improvement of the Outdoor Education Center at Raquette Lake; 3) accommodating growing enrollment especially in terms of residence hall and student recreational facilities; and, 4) continuing to build the physical plant infrastructure to take care of daily maintenance.

Responsibility for assessing progress towards meeting these goals rests with the Facilities Master Plan Oversight Committee (FMPOC). Part of the committee’s charge as stated in the College Handbook is to “regularly assess the progress of the Master Plan; to continually monitor and review proposals for changes to the Master Plan using consistency with the mission of the College and to serve as ombudsperson in resolving future space use conflicts that the plan’s execution may generate.” The FMPOC is a presidentially-appointed committee, and consists of academic faculty, administrative representatives, Faculty Senate representatives, one former member from the Master Plan Update Steering Committee, the associate vice president for facilities management (ex officio) and the vice president for finance and management (ex officio).

Other structures and mechanisms in place for assessing progress towards meeting the campus’ infrastructure goals include the Five Year Capital Plan review process, the Environmental Health and Safety Management Committee, the Traffic and Circulation Program Study, and the Physical Plant Annual Survey. In addition, the Cornish/Van Hoesen Program Study deals specifically with the immediate and long-term needs of the Education Department as well as other campus needs and concerns. The Facilities Planning and Construction Project log,
which is updated each month, lists all ongoing construction and renovation projects both on- and off-campus, making it easy to track progress in these areas. Copies of this log are available in the Middle States office. Facilities planning and construction also maintains an excellent web site on all current projects, at http://www.cortland.edu/facilities/fp_c.htm. This site not only serves to monitor progress in these areas but also to inform the campus community of ongoing construction and renovation. Finally the Student Opinion Survey (SOS), administered by SUNY every three years, contains a number of items evaluating students’ perceptions of issues related to facilities and campus environment. Table 17 includes a listing of these items as well as information bearing on how SUNY Cortland compares to the other twelve university colleges on each.

Table 17
Mean SOS Scores for SUNY Cortland and All University Colleges on Facilities-Related and Other Campus Environment Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SUNY Cortland Rank (out of 13 univ. colleges)</th>
<th>SUNY Cortland Mean</th>
<th>University College Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletic facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00*</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus bus service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.29*</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus services for victims of crime</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom facilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.55*</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer laboratories</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of buildings and grounds</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of residence halls</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of campus crime statistics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.34*</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library facilities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.52*</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal security/safety on campus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.26*</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science laboratories</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study areas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.50*</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SOS items are ranked on a 1 to 5 scale, with higher scores indicating higher satisfaction. Asterisk indicates that SUNY Cortland mean score was significantly different than university college mean score.

In contrast to the tools available for assessing the adequacy of campus facilities, the planning process for updating instructional equipment is less formalized. The recently hired property control officer has made great progress providing an accurate and current inventory of the equipment on campus. Still, the process for assessing and updating this equipment remains sporadic. When academic equipment money becomes available, the deans ask department chairs to submit a prioritized list of equipment needs. The deans review the requests and, based on the
amount of anticipated funding, they forward their recommendations to the provost for final approval. The uncertain and limited nature of the funding often results in departments requesting the same equipment year after year.

**Resources**

There have been several key changes in structure and additions of personnel that have greatly enhanced the College’s ability to meet its infrastructure needs. These changes include greater coordination of the offices of facilities planning and construction, physical plant, and environmental health and safety under the direction of the newly created associate vice president for facilities management. Further, long range planning and construction delivery has been improved by dividing the responsibilities for the Office of Facilities Planning and Construction between an assistant director of construction and an assistant director of planning, as has space utilization and assessment capabilities through the new property control officer position.

Funding for improvements to campus infrastructure is controlled through the State University Construction Fund (SUCF). In 1998 SUCF began using a five-year Capital Plan to give campuses more input in directing resources to address their own priorities, although SUCF still retains final control on how the money is spent. In the current five-year plan SUNY (1998-2003) Cortland was allocated a total of $41 million through this process and in special funding. This sum included $15 million approved by the legislature to be earmarked for the construction of the new stadium. The College also receives a yearly lump sum amount -- currently around $254,000 -- that can be directed at its discretion toward minor rehabilitation and capital improvement projects.

**Analysis**

**Congruence Between College Mission and Program Goals**

The Master Plan process has done a great deal to ensure that the goals for infrastructure maintenance and improvement are congruent with the mission of the College. Table 18 summarizes the five goals outlined in the 1996 *Master Plan Update*. As this table shows, Goals I, II, and IV are directly targeted at providing the infrastructure necessary to fulfill the Mission Statement’s pledge to “excellence in teaching, scholarship, research and service to the community.” Goals III and V are targeted at enhancing the beauty, functionality, and accessibility of campus, which literally forms the landscape against which the College’s mission is realized.
Table 18
Summary of Goals from the Master Plan Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Complete the campus data communications network giving every classroom, laboratory, office and residence hall room electronic access to time, voice, data, multimedia, and networked information from both on and off-campus sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Provide adequately sized, configured, and equipped teaching and learning spaces, and adequate support for those spaces campus-wide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Improve the campus’ exterior aesthetic and functional qualities to promote not only its beauty, but accessibility by making it inviting to campus users, the surrounding community and local region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Renovate facilities, reorganize space, and/or relocate campus-wide functions to create the level of functionality necessary to operate academic programs and campus services successfully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Develop a “campus core” in a location that links the academic and residential portions of campus into an attractive and cohesive gathering place promoting the interchange of ideas and social relationships among various categories of students and with faculty from all parts of the campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment of Programs, Functions, Services

Capital improvements. Since 1998 the College has enjoyed phenomenal and unprecedented success with respect to initiating and completing capital improvement projects. In less than three years, SUNY Cortland has committed and expended over 99% of its $41 million appropriation for the 1998-2003 Capital Plan. Project expenditures per year from fiscal year 1997 to 2001 show an almost 300% increase in total annual expenditures from 1997 to 2000. Further, 71% of the total expenditures for that five-year period were made in 2000 and 2001! A detailed summary of these expenditures is found in Chapter 8 of this document.

Goal attainment. Much has been accomplished in recent years to meet campus infrastructure goals, and much more is being done at present on an ongoing basis. The infrastructure for Goals I and II of the Master Plan Update, which related primarily to technology, has already been largely developed (see Chapter 12 for a more detailed description of this progress). Several projects have also recently been completed that address many of the needs outlined in Goals III and IV. For example, the $3.8 million American Disabilities Act (ADA) project provided for the construction of a 3-mile campus-wide ADA accessible sidewalk connecting all major buildings, installation of areas of refuge and elevators and shafts in different buildings, and modifications to entrances and bathrooms in various buildings. In addition, the campus Admissions Office was relocated to the first floor of the Miller Building, giving a new, positive face to prospective students and their parents, and numerous improvements have been made to the Outdoor Education Center at Raquette Lake, including construction of a new classroom building and a water sewage treatment plant.
Student perceptions as measured through the SOS also bear upon Goals III and IV from the *Master Plan Update*. For example, on the 2000 survey, SUNY Cortland’s athletic facilities were rated number one among the 13 university colleges and, in fact, were rated first among all 28 state-operated SUNY colleges. Overall condition of the campus buildings and grounds was ranked ninth, though the College’s mean score for this item was not significantly different than the university college mean.

While capital improvements to the campus are remarkable, and much of the Master Plan has been implemented, problems remain. Almost no progress has been made on Goal V of the Master Plan, which called for the creation of a “campus core” linking the academic and residential portions of campus in an attractive location. Also, as revealed on the 1999 Physical Plant Customer Survey, overall physical conditions on campus ranked 3.1 out of a maximum of 5. This figure does represent an improvement from the 3.02 ranking obtained in 1998, but still lags behind the national norm of 3.27. In particular, customer satisfaction with heating/air conditioning and campus lighting ranked 2.5 and 2.9, well below the national norms of 3.22 and 3.65, respectively.

**Instructional buildings and related infrastructure.** An analysis of SUNY Cortland’s existing space versus the calculated space the College would need to meet SUNY standards, based on 1999 data, shows that in most areas there is more than adequate space to fulfill the mission and goals of the College. Specifically, the College has 43% more classroom and lecture space, 39% more faculty office space, and 20% more general administration space than is required by SUNY guidelines. One area that is lacking involves space for research, as the College’s existing space for this purpose is 20% less than what is needed according to the SUNY criteria. Perhaps this last finding partially explains the fact that over 25% of academic department chairs responding to the Middle States questionnaire cited the need for additional space to meet growing and changing department demands as one of the key infrastructure-related issues their department will face in the next few years.

As shown in Table 18, student perceptions of the campus instructional environment as revealed through the SOS do not indicate many significant differences relative to other SUNY university colleges. Specifically, on the 2000 SOS the College’s classroom facilities were rated significantly higher compared to the university college mean, study areas were rated significantly lower, and there were no significant differences with respect to library facilities, science laboratories, or computer labs.

**Health safety, campus security, and energy conservation policies.** Health safety issues remain a high priority on campus and have been addressed through projects to remove asbestos at the Dowd Fine Arts and Miller buildings,
remove PCB contaminated transformers, and construct a 90-day chemical management facility. In addition, the Office of Environmental Health and Safety has prepared spill prevention plans, sponsored safety training programs, and has been engaged in recording, collecting and providing for safe disposal of a variety of hazardous materials on campus. The College Environmental Health and Safety Management Committee meets regularly to monitor the overall safety program, and there is annual training for compliance in a variety of safety areas such as use and storage of hazardous materials and fire safety. Since 1996 more than $70,000 has been spent in hazardous material disposal and, for both health safety and expense-related reasons, the campus intends within the next five years to be reclassified from a large-quantity to small-quantity generator of hazardous waste. The College has also formed a new Chemical Management Committee to institute control processes and monitor compliance.

With respect to campus safety and security, human resources, university police, residential services, financial aid, judicial affairs, student affairs and public relations all play a role in activities related to these issues. As required by the Federal Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act, university police file reports on a regular basis, and this unit also provides weekly updates on violations to the campus community via e-mail. This practice was recognized positively on the 2000 SOS, with students ranking the College first among the 13 university colleges in its dissemination of campus crime statistics.

Crime statistics from the past three years show that, overall, the SUNY Cortland campus is relatively crime-free, especially with respect to serious incidents involving violence, assault, or theft. To illustrate, the number of offenses classifiable as FBI index crimes totaled 29 in 1998, 31 in 1999, and 16 in 2000, with the highest proportion of these incidents each year consisting of burglaries. Overall, the total number of other offenses has remained consistent over that time, averaging around 600 per year. Despite these statistics, on the 2000 SOS SUNY Cortland ranked twelfth among the university colleges in students’ feelings of personal security and safety, significantly below the university college average (but with a mean response of 3.26, well above the midpoint of “3” on the SOS response scale). The College also was ranked ninth out of 13 with respect to campus services for victims of crime, though this difference was not significant and, again, the mean response for Cortland on this item exceeded “3.”

Energy conservation efforts are coordinated through the Office of the Vice President for Finance and Management, which distributes pertinent conservation materials to the campus and works with building administrators and central heating plant staff to monitor compliance with established policies. In addition, in 1998
CES/Way Energy completed a major energy conservation project across campus. The 2001 Sempra Energy Audit estimates the annual utility savings from this project to be between $1.3 million and $1.7 million.

Transportation and parking. As is the case at many college campuses, traffic and parking are particular problems at SUNY Cortland. On the 2000 SOS, students rated the College twelfth out of thirteen university colleges on parking, significantly below the university college mean. The College’s bus service, however, was ranked sixth, significantly better than the university college average. To assess the problem and identify solutions, a Traffic and Circulation Program Study was completed in 1999. Many of the recommendations from this report have already been addressed, including the provision of frequent bus service and improvements to the remote 281 parking lot; installing new bus shelters and increasing bus services throughout campus; creating new monumental entrance signs at campus entry points; installing campus directional and building identification signs; and repairing sidewalks and stairs to greatly enhance pedestrian safety. In addition, a $1 million project to improve roads and sidewalks is designed but awaits funding to be implemented.

Residential facilities. Continued enrollment growth has created an increased demand for student housing and, even though enrollment has stabilized for the time being, there is a nationwide trend for students to be more interested in on-campus housing. SUNY Cortland’s housing problem was partially alleviated by the recent purchase of West Campus, a 15-building apartment complex, which has been converted to campus student housing. Still, student housing shortages continue to be compounded by the ongoing residence hall renovations. The College anticipates having one residence hall off-line for renovation each year for the foreseeable future. One indication of the success of these renovations, however, has been the strong demand by the student population to live in the newly-renovated residence halls. Finally, according to the 2000 SOS, SUNY Cortland students ranked the College’s residence halls ninth out of 13, but the mean score was not significantly different from the university college mean.

Strengths, Weaknesses, and Problems

Aging and underutilized infrastructure. While the infrastructure on campus is generally perceived as adequate and some features are perceived very positively by students, the College’s facilities suffer from a number of problems. Perhaps the largest problem is the fact that all instructional buildings on campus are at least 30 years old. The new five-year plan has identified 248 maintenance issues totaling $50 million that by definition are critical to the ongoing safety and integrity of the physical infrastructure on campus. The projects include replacing steam and
condensation lines, replacing roofs on at least seven buildings, repairing and rebuilding numerous sets of stairs across campus, installing fire alarm systems, and rebuilding or repairing sidewalks in various locations.

This situation is complicated by the fact that many departments and offices are occupying space that was designed for other functions. The Cornish/Van Hoesen Building was originally designed as a campus school, and has been converted to accommodate the Education Department, many student service units, offices, and other functions. As a result, there is a great need to renovate this building to meet the needs of the departments and programs housed there more effectively. These problems and possible solutions are discussed in more detail in the Cornish/Van Hoesen Program Study and the 1999 Report of the Cornish/Van Hoesen Vision Subcommittee.

Space planning and reallocation. Another issue hindering more efficient use of campus buildings is the lack of a comprehensive plan for reallocating space based on curriculum and enrollment changes. Currently the FMPOC is responsible for approving any changes in existing space usage. Without a comprehensive plan, however, changes are approved on a case-by-case basis without knowing how they fit into the College’s long range plans. For example, Studio West was developed to provide short-term “surge” space for departments or individuals displaced by construction. As departments expand or new departments are created, however, they have been assigned to this space for the short term, with no plans for where they might relocate in the future. This problem is exacerbated by New York State and campus policies that restrict the disposal of old and surplus materials. As a result, usable space is often taken up with the storage of materials that no longer have any value to the College or its programs.

Equipment, materials and other resources. While nearly one third of academic department chairs responding to the Middle States questionnaire cited significant improvements in the acquisition of equipment in recent years, nearly 25% still stated they had important equipment needs that are not being met by the current procurement process. As one example, of the $128,412 worth of equipment requested last year by departments in the School of Professional Studies nearly 40% ($48,501) was not funded, and there is no clear commitment as to when or if these remaining requests will be funded in the future. Therefore, in addition to not meeting some significant department needs, the current process does not allow departments to plan on receiving equipment according to a definite timetable. Similarly, although the College has invested enormous resources into new technology, at present there is no schedule in place for replacing faculty and staff computers on a regular basis, often resulting in a scramble to find funding sources when such replacement is needed.
**Athletic facilities.** As revealed through 2000 SOS data, the College’s athletic facilities are virtually unrivaled across SUNY’s state-operated campuses based on student perceptions, and these findings are consistent with earlier administrations of the survey. The new $18 million stadium will undoubtedly heighten these impressions further, and will also build on the College’s traditional strength in physical education, improve dramatically the public face of the College, and provide a regional draw to the community for a variety of athletic and cultural events, including the 2002 Empire State Games and Senior Games. While this facility will be an excellent addition to SUNY Cortland’s already extensive network of athletic facilities, there remain many serious deferred maintenance and long range planning issues that must be addressed if the College is to fully capitalize on these assets. Specifically, existing fields are overused with little or no down time necessary for common maintenance practices such as field rotation, aeration, and proper seeding and watering schedules. This problem results in part because snow and inclement weather make the fields unusable for roughly half the academic year. Another concern is that no plan exists for dismantling and reuse or disposal of existing facility assets such as aluminum bleachers (e.g., those at Davis Field), sports lighting, and other equipment that could enhance the upgrading and renovation of existing facilities.

**Student Recreation Center.** Although SUNY Cortland’s athletic facilities are clearly of high quality, their recreational use is necessarily subordinate to their primary use by physical education and athletics. As a result, there is a serious need for recreational facilities for the general student population, a conclusion that was reached by the Student Recreation Center Task Force in its February 2000 report and the accompanying “Recreational Needs Assessment of SUNY Cortland Students” conducted by a graduate class in recreation and leisure studies. In addition to meeting this need, a Student Recreation Center could help address the one unmet goal of the Master Plan, or Goal V, which calls for the development of a campus center where students can engage in a variety of activities and socialize with each other.

**Adequacy of Resources**

The need for significant, ongoing fiscal resources is critical to the maintenance and improvement of SUNY Cortland’s campus infrastructure. Funds from the current five-year plan (1998-2003), however, have all been allocated, and $14 million in designed projects remain unfunded and will have to be deferred until the next five-year plan. The 2003-2008 five-year plan has identified $50 million in critical maintenance projects and an additional $81 million in plant adaptation projects. Although the state has not yet determined the level of funding to be provided
for these projects, the College anticipates it will be in the $20-30 million range. Since at least 80% of these funds will necessarily be dedicated to critical maintenance items, precious few resources exist to meet other important needs, including the College’s top priority as stated in its MOU with System Administration, finding an adequate and appropriate home for the education department.

Summary and Recommendations

Growing enrollments and increased demand for on-campus housing, changing departmental needs, scarce resources, and planning for utilizing the new stadium in an optimal fashion are only a few of the issues that will have a significant impact on the physical infrastructure of campus in the next five years. On the basis of this evaluation, the College should implement the following actions with respect to campus infrastructure:

1. Identify source of funding in order to fully implement one or more of the options presented in the Cornish/Van Hoesen Program Study and the 1999 Report of the Cornish/Van Hoesen Vision Subcommittee.

2. Supplement the general guidelines of the Master Plan with a detailed room-by-room study of space utilization on campus, to include specific recommendations for recapturing underutilized space, reallocating existing space to meet the increased space needs of new and growing departments, especially for research purposes, and developing a streamlined process for disposing of surplus equipment.

3. Develop and fund an academic equipment plan for regular equipment review, upgrade and acquisition, to include computer upgrades, with large or expensive equipment purchases included in a longer-range equipment plan.

4. Identify and pursue alternate funding mechanisms for the construction of a new residence hall, perhaps one that is combined with a new Student Recreation Center.

5. Develop a strategic management plan for campus infrastructure to address overall use, staffing, planned maintenance cycles, renovation, and upgrading of all campus facilities, including athletic and recreational facilities.

6. Develop a plan and assign responsibility for improving students’ perceptions of campus security and safety, with the goal of seeing improvement by the next administration of the SOS in 2003.
RECOMMENDATIONS

CHAPTER 16

Chapter 3 - Academic Programs

1. Continue to support the goal of increasing the percentage of full-time faculty, through resource reallocation if necessary, using current and reliable data to create an equitable workload situation across the College.

2. Provide necessary support to the provost’s office so that the provost can lead academic affairs in developing and guiding a strategic agenda.

3. Conduct a needs analysis of units in Academic Affairs with respect to office budget, staffing, travel support, professional development, and technology needs, and make adjustments where necessary.

4. Continue the process of decentralizing the budget, empowering the provost and deans in particular to have increased budget and position control and holding them accountable.

5. The provost should establish a task force to address the issue of possible restructuring within the College or at least within Professional Studies to better manage program enrollments as well as faculty, administrative, and advisement workloads.

6. The Professional Studies Chairs’ Council should work closely with Enrollment Management to more effectively administer program enrollment consistent with standards and quality expectations.

7. Smaller-enrollment departments should work with Admissions to provide supplemental strategies for recruiting undergraduates to their programs.

8. All departments should report on the quality of their advisement practices in their annual report and program review reports. Additionally, continued efforts should be made to reduce advisement loads (including both undergraduate and graduate advisees).

9. Develop a structure for coordinating internships across the College, perhaps by creating an encompassing office that oversees efforts presently carried out by the Internship Office, Field Studies, and individual departments.

10. The Facilities and Master Plan Oversight Committee should include a member of the Professional Studies Chairs’ Council and of the Arts and Sciences’ Chairs’ Council so that the schools can monitor the progress being made with respect to the Cornish/Van Hoesen and Moffett rehabilitation projects.

11. The Facilities and Master Plan Oversight Committee must give highest priority to planning for additional space to meet Professional Studies’ needs given enrollment increases and plans to add new faculty lines.

12. Revise the College’s long range planning process so as to ensure input and participation by departments and centers.

13. Develop a plan to renovate and upgrade the laboratories in the natural science departments and the main theater in Dowd Fine Arts.

14. Develop a plan to support faculty scholarly travel needs at a higher rate, with a goal of $1,000 annually for untenured full-time faculty and $750 for tenured faculty.

15. Seek ways to increase funding for technology and communication needs by allocating more state funds for technology, raising the technology fee to support growing student initiatives, and securing more grants and corporation contracts.
16. Continue to provide leadership with respect to the College’s long range planning goal of infusing technology across the College for both instructional and non-instructional functions.

17. Develop a permanent growth budget for library materials, including both print materials and emerging technologies.

18. Develop a plan for upgrading the network and telephone switch.

19. Continue to assess the technology, computer and library needs of the campus in order to maximize services by integrating the results into all planning efforts.

20. Hire key faculty with strong research backgrounds who can successfully attract significant external funding, with initial priority placed on funding to support the College’s urban education initiative.

21. Maintain an institutional commitment to supporting and assisting first-time proposal writers.

22. Transfer oversight for graduate admissions to the Graduate Studies and Outreach Office.

23. Develop comprehensive enrollment management plan for College’s graduate programs.

24. Increase proportion of full-time faculty who offer instruction at the Mohawk Valley Graduate Center.

25. Stabilize and restore each of the original structures constructed by W.W. Durant located on Pine Knot in Raquette Lake at the Outdoor Education Center, expanding the endowment and identifying benefactors to assure the continued operation of the Center.

Chapter 4 – Enrollment Management

1. Reaffirm explicitly that recruitment is not the sole responsibility of Admissions, further delineate the roles to be played in this process by deans, department chairs, and faculty, and encourage collective engagement in this process.

2. Build rapport and collaboration with faculty to increase faculty involvement and allow for greater faculty insight and guidance into Advisement Center initiatives.

3. Revise the transfer credit evaluation procedures to include more faculty/advisor ownership and involvement.

4. Establish a stronger base of understanding and participation in the First-Year Program initiative, emphasizing the role of Student Affairs.

5. Conduct a needs analysis to determine adequacy of resources across Enrollment Management, to include examination of the need for an inquiry management position and an additional Financial Aid Advisor, professional development and training needs, adequacy of clerical staff, and the need for temporary summer staffing.

6. Build in more participation by Enrollment Management in the clarification of academic processes and procedures so this unit can become a stronger advocate for the comprehension and implementation of these.

7. Coordinate and promote efforts that will increase student satisfaction and positively affect student retention, to include strategies for identifying and supporting students facing situations that place them at risk for attrition.

8. Evaluate at what point electronic communication may be a requirement for students to perform certain tasks and when a prospective student would be granted access to the Student Information System.
Chapter 5 – Faculty and Staff

1. Continue to make progress toward goal of having 80% of all courses taught by full-time faculty members.

2. Add full-time lecturer positions as appropriate, taking into consideration the impact of these appointments upon the advisement and service loads of full-time tenure-track faculty in the departments in question.

3. Continue and strengthen efforts to add ethnic minority faculty and staff members, with a focus on females.

4. Continue to support the activities of the Faculty Development Committee and work toward having a Faculty Development Center overseen by a full-time director.

5. Significantly strengthen professional development opportunities for faculty and staff that address the needs of individuals as well as college goals and priorities.

Chapter 6 – Student Affairs

1. Expand external grant funding and aggressively seek creative alternatives for supporting programs and services as well as continue to advocate for more state funding.

2. Develop a prioritized re-organizational plan that serves to redefine and create new positions within the division as lines become available.

3. Create strategies for addressing the increased caseload of serious student misconduct both on- and off-campus, so as to improve the campus climate and to reduce the volume of judicial cases.

4. Develop and fund a plan to provide professional development support for Student Affairs staff.

5. Use CSI data more systematically in order to guide the division’s planning and programming efforts.

6. Develop and fund a plan to address how the campus will continue to effectively serve the increasing number of students with disabilities.

7. Continue to pursue funding options for the construction of a new residence hall and a Student Recreation Center.

Chapter 7 – Institutional Advancement

1. Continue and expand the use of private funds to recruit and retain high quality students and faculty so as to ensure the success of private fund-raising efforts in the future.

2. Grow the number of alumni chapters to increase national visibility and outreach and provide more alumni career guidance to students.

3. Secure an alumni house.

4. Expand support for website maintenance.

5. Continue to provide enhancements in Public Relations and Publications and Electronic Media in the form of technology and personnel, through the addition of clerical and professional positions.

Chapter 8 – Finance and Management

1. Continue to critically analyze current resource usage focusing on student fees, the technology fee and budget, budgets for hiring adjunct faculty, and department/unit budgets.
2. Create a task force to examine planning procedures for developing staffing needs at the College along with a more automated process for handling the hiring of new faculty and staff.

3. Charge the Child Care Center Board of Directors to assess student child care needs, including those for non-traditional students, and if space demands warrant, form a task force to examine other possible sites to resolve space and operational issues for the Center.

4. Form a task force to compare the results of the analysis of current space on campus with a common space standard and to develop a long-term space allocation plan.

5. Form a joint committee from Finance and Management and Academic Affairs to make recommendations on possible off-site programs and locations.

6. Monitor new budgeting processes closely and continue to provide mechanisms for more campus input.

7. Work closely with the Facilities Office to complete renovations in the Student Accounting area in order to improve efficiency and professional appearance.

8. Continue to meet with colleagues from other SUNY institutions to strengthen the Business Office’s network and build long-term relationships with other campuses, and provide frequent communication with SUNY System Administration in order to close the experience gap for newer employees in the office.

9. Create a task force to include representatives from Human Resources and all units within the Business Office to develop user-friendly manuals for training new employees.

10. Analyze the operations of the Business Office and develop and fund a reorganizational plan that would allow the gradual addition of new positions in key areas, coupled with the development of a retention plan to better assure continuity of staff.

11. Develop and fund a plan to provide more resources for Facilities Management in order to create a second shift for Physical Plant, increase budgets in Physical Plant and Environmental Health and Safety by 25%, and to support capital improvement projects that address critical maintenance items.

12. Develop a comprehensive and integrated policy and procedure manual for all three units.

13. Convert the academic building records on CAD by summer 2002 in order to fully utilize and assess the effectiveness of the TMA system, at least for Physical Plant.

14. Continue to monitor the effectiveness of modifications made to communication programs both internal to Facilities Management and external with the campus community in order to maximize service and report project status.

15. Analyze post-project evaluations and develop goals to enhance project delivery.

16. Develop a Facilities Management personnel plan to address issues within the unit such as high turnover, new staff training, salaries, and salary inequity.

17. Continue to pursue projects like the Minor Construction Team and Labor Term contracts, which help save time and money on small projects without sacrificing quality.

18. Develop an Environmental Management plan to help reduce the high cost of hazardous waste disposal.

Chapter 9 – Planning and Assessment

1. Create explicit and publicly acknowledged linkages among budgeting, planning, and assessment processes.
2. Identify ongoing, stable funding source for long range planning process and for assessment.

3. Incorporate academic program assessment planning process into System Administration’s program review process.

4. Maintain annual assessment planning and implementation process for support and service units.

5. Assess faculty attitudes toward assessment and develop strategies based on results for responding to any concerns that emerge.

6. Develop and implement assessment of institutional goals for student learning, perhaps in conjunction with efforts to meet System Administration’s requirements for general education assessment.

7. Attempt to involve students more actively in both long range planning and outcomes assessment.

**Chapter 10 – Equity, Access, and Diversity**

1. Add full-time staff position to Office of Multicultural Affairs, so as to provide greater direction to underrepresented student groups, better integrating the offices and programs that relate to diversity and multiculturalism among students and faculty, and better advocating for these persons and groups.

2. Increase frequency of SOS administration in order to better monitor campus climate for underrepresented populations, making sure that these populations are proportionately included in the sample.

3. Include Center for Multicultural and Gender Studies in College’s assessment program, to include assessment of all its academic programs and support functions.

4. Reinstate a program like the Campus Dialogue on Race, which was held in 1999-2000, on a regular basis, with the administration and faculty and staff groups working together to coordinate this event.

5. Create a standing committee on Ethnic Minority Student Recruitment and Retention including representatives from Admissions, EOP, Advisement and First-Year Programs, Athletics, and the Multicultural Affairs Office, for the purpose of increasing the visibility of those programs known to be particularly attractive to ethnic minority students and coordinating efforts on orientation, mentoring, and advisement for all self-identified ethnic minority students.

6. Conduct a study on the College’s ability to serve the increasing number of students with disabilities and develop an action agenda working with Student Disability Services.

**Chapter 11 – Intellectual Climate**

1. Increase faculty development efforts aimed at non-technological aspects of innovative teaching.

2. Form a task force consisting of College’s Distinguished Teaching Professors and Excellence Award winners for the purpose of directly addressing SUNY Cortland’s problems with intellectual climate as revealed by negative SOS ratings as well as CSI findings, with specific recommendations to be made for resolving these problems.

3. Institute annual Opening Convocation or other event at beginning of year to set serious academic tone for incoming students.

4. Appoint task force to explore ways to boost faculty and student attendance at cultural events on campus.

5. Implement past recommendations regarding advisement.

6. Expand efforts to ease teaching and advisement loads in departments with high ratios of majors to faculty.
7. Continue and reinforce efforts to bolster enrollments in Arts and Sciences beyond the Title III grant initiative, using strategies that foster communication and a sense of common purpose between the faculty of the two schools as well as the administration.

Chapter 12 – Technology

1. Continue to seek ways of funding increased bandwidth and server space, in conjunction with implementing strategies for prioritizing access to the College’s communications network.

2. Ensure that all academic programs include clear and appropriately rigorous competencies in the areas of information and computer literacy.

3. Develop a comprehensive definition of student competence in information and computer literacy and implement an assessment process college-wide to assess this competence, perhaps in conjunction with the SUNY general education assessment initiative.

4. Ensure that faculty are given a larger role in planning for technology, perhaps through CATE, SCAP (Student Computer Access Program), and the Information Resources Advisory Committee.

5. Develop and fund an operational and financial technology plan that addresses staff and resource support, replacement of classroom equipment, computer hardware and software in offices and labs, networking upgrades, and upgrades in current SMART classrooms.

6. Develop and fund a plan that provides adequate technical support and instruction to the increasingly technology-sophisticated needs of faculty and staff.

7. Develop a college-wide plan for distance learning and periodically assess faculty and student needs with respect to distance learning for the purpose of planning for future programs.

8. Periodically assess SMART classroom use to ensure that facilities are being used appropriately for the technology provided.

9. Develop and fund a plan to ensure that Memorial Library’s budget increases are commensurate with its expenditures for electronic resources, so that its funding for more traditional learning materials is not further eroded.

Chapter 13 – Internal Institutional Context

1. The Provost should establish a standing committee charged with making recommendations to the president regarding an optimal enrollment and enrollment mix, taking into account factors such as number of faculty, workload, campus safety, housing, and campus morale.

2. The Provost should establish a task force to analyze faculty workload across departments and schools and make recommendations where appropriate for addressing problem areas, with findings made public and opportunities provided for campus-wide discussion.

3. The College, working through appropriate faculty committees, should develop teaching strategies targeted at the characteristics that place SUNY Cortland students at academic risk, and encourage the widespread use of these strategies.

4. The College should regularly conduct surveys of employee morale as part of its overall assessment plan, being sure to include all employee groups.

5. The Faculty Senate should survey faculty and staff as to reasons why they do or do not participate in the Senate, then use the results to develop appropriate strategies for increasing participation.
The College should enhance professional development opportunities for department chairs and program coordinators through annual orientation sessions on topics including: Budgeting, supervision and human resources, and increase awareness of and support for attendance at administrative workshops and conferences.

Chapter 14 – External Institutional Context

1. Develop a task force of administrators and faculty to carefully examine the classification of all programs and courses so that the College can maximize funding via the PBBA formula.

2. Target special programs that do not generate large FTE’s but are critical to the College’s mission for creative and alternate funding solutions.

3. Keep enrollment management at the forefront in order to maximize overall student recruitment and retention, and to maximize enrollment in under-enrolled programs and courses that are categorized as high-cost under the PBBA formula.

4. Seek innovative incentives to encourage and reward faculty and staff members who are instrumental in the implementation of activities critical to the College’s future (e.g., NCATE accreditation).

5. Continue to foster positive and mutually beneficial relations with the College Council, the Cortland community, alumni, and local legislators, and use these relationships to promote SUNY Cortland at the state and System Administration levels.

Chapter 15 – Infrastructure

1. Identify source of funding in order to fully implement one or more of the options presented in the Cornish/Van Hoesen Program Study and the 1999 Report of the Cornish/Van Hoesen Vision Subcommittee.

2. Supplement the general guidelines of the Master Plan with a detailed room-by-room study of space utilization on campus, to include specific recommendations for recapturing underutilized space, reallocating existing space to meet the increased space needs of new and growing departments, especially for research purposes, and developing a streamlined process for disposing of surplus equipment.

3. Develop and fund an academic equipment plan for regular equipment review, upgrade and acquisition, to include computer upgrades, with large or expensive equipment purchases included in a longer-range equipment plan.

4. Identify and pursue alternate funding mechanisms for the construction of a new residence hall, perhaps one that is combined with a new Student Recreation Center.

5. Develop a strategic management plan for campus infrastructure to address overall use, staffing, planned maintenance cycles, renovation, and upgrading of all campus facilities, including athletic and recreational facilities.

6. Develop a plan and assign responsibility for improving students’ perceptions of campus security and safety, with the goal of seeing improvement by the next administration of the SOS in 2003.