DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 358 770 HE 026 498

AUTHOR Johnstone, D. Bruce

TITLE 10 Tough Questions about Your State University and

Ten Candid Answers from the SUNY Chancellor.

INSTITUTION New York State Univ. System, Albany.

PUB DATE Feb 93 NOTE 26p.

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Guides - Classroom Use

- Instructional Materials (For Learner) (051)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Budgeting; College Faculty; College Outcomes

Assessment; *Educational Finance; *Educational

Planning; *Educational Quality; Financial Exigency;

Financial Problems; Higher Education; Public Colleges; Research and Development Centers;

Retrenchment; School Effectiveness; School Funds; School Role; State Colleges; *Undergraduate Study

IDENTIFIERS State University of New York

ABSTRACT

In this booklet the Chancellor of the State University of New York (SUNY) provides answers to 10 difficult questions concerning issues of costs, accountability, and evaluation in the SUNY system. Questions concern the following issues: (1) the losses incurred in recent years by the State-operated campuses and the community colleges; (2) the issue of SUNY being oversized and the recent cutbacks being necessary just to bring the school down to manageable levels that taxpayers can afford; (3) the possibility of campus closings; (4) the possible specialization of campuses for cost-cutting purposes; (5) the issue of increasing faculty workload or reducing research as a means of saving money: (6) tuition adjustments to increase revenue; (7) the idea of developing one or more of the campuses into research centers with the intent of achieving a major reputation as a research university; (8) whether educational quality at the undergraduate level is being sacrificed by too much concentration on faculty research, graduate studies, and consultation; (9) whether the university should conduct college preparatory courses; and (10) the extent to which the university knows whether it is providing the necessary skills and education to its students. (GLR)



Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made

ED358770

TOUGH QUESTIONS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SUNY, Albany

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABOUT YOUR STATE UNIVERSITY

AND TEN CANDID ANSWERS

FROM THE SUNY CHANCELLOR

79

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION / CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official

OERI position or policy

HES ?

ERIC

Full Text Provided by ERIC

BEST CORY AVAILABLES

D. Bruce Johnstone, Chancellor State University of New York February, 1993

10 TOUGH QUESTIONS

AM USED TO TOUGH QUESTIONS

ABOUT THE STATE UNIVERSITY. I get them in the course of testimony before the higher education and fiscal committees of the Legislature. in discussions with the Division of the Budget, in meetings with reporters and editorial boards, and in one-on-one conversations with this state's business and civic leaders. Some questions reveal a suspicion that something may be wrong with the State University. Many of the tough questions pick up on themes from the national press, usually reflecting anger at the nation's leading (often private) research universities

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

and having no direct basis in a perception about SUNY, other than that SUNY, too, is a "university" and therefore thought likely to be guilty of whatever Stanford or Harvard was recently found guilty (forgetting, perhaps, that most of SUNY is undergraduate education, even community colleges, and bears faint resemblance to Stanford or Harvard). Some of the questions reflect an understandable frustration with the public sector generally. Some reflect a frustration with New York's relatively high taxes (not knowing that SUNY gets a far lower percentage of these tax revenues than do the public university systems of most states).



But all of the questions are honest and reasonable.

Very few reflect any preconceived animus toward public higher education or toward the State

University of New York. Many go to the heart of problems that we recognize and are striving to correct or improve. And all deserve thoughtful and candid answers.

Following, then, are the ten toughest questions I get about SUNY, together with my best answers. I am pleased always to have them asked because, hard as they are, they are eminently answerable, and I firmly believe that the State University of New York, for all the goals that still lie before us, is a quality, cost-effective system of which the citizens of this state can be proud.

describe "cuts": loss of tax dollar support, cuts in total budget, cuts in total budget adjusted for inflation, cuts "to the base" and "one-time cuts," cuts in the most recent year versus cuts over longer periods of time, etc. What is the most meaningful measure of the losses incurred in recent years by the State-operated campuses and the community colleges?

FOR THE STATE-OPERATED AND FUNDED CAMPUSES, THE REAL NET DOWNSIZING OF THE SYSTEM HAS BEEN ABOUT \$200 MILLION, OR ABOUT 10 PERCENT OF OUR TOTAL OPERATING expenditures, over the past four years. That includes adjusting for our own inflation (which has actually been very low because salaries have been frozen for the last two years), and after a doubling of tuition. The cut to the community colleges is more difficult to describe because of the interplay of state support, sponsor support, and tuition and because of the differences among the 30 community colleges. They have lost in the last three years virtually all categorical program support — more than \$29 million in special vocational and firm-specific course aid — . plus nearly \$18 million in base aid, before any estimate of losses due to uncovered wage and salary and general price increases.

If one were to take a longer sweep of time,

the cuts taken by the State-operated campuses since the mid-1970s have been in the range of 15 to 20 percent — a loss of some 5,800 faculty and staff and corresponding current expenditures, equal to the combined total staffs and state purpose budgets of the university centers at Albany and Binghamton, the colleges at Buffalo, Brockport, Potsdam, and Farmingdale, and the statutory SUNY College of Ceramics at Alfred University.

WASN'T SUNY ACTUALLY OVERBUI

IN RECENT YEARS JUST BEEN A KIND OF "RIGHT-SIZ-ING," BRINGING SUNY DOWN TO AN APPROPRIATE LEVEL THAT THE NEW YORK STATE TAXPAYERS CAN

AFFORD?

"OVERBUILT", IT IS STILL A FAR, FAR SMALLER AND LEANER SYSTEM, FOR THE SIZE OF THE STATE, THAN ALMOST ANY OTHER STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM.

SUNY LOOKS LARGE ONLY BECAUSE NEW YORK

STATE IS LARGE AND BECAUSE THE SUNY SYSTEM,

UNLIKE THE SYSTEMS OF CALIFORNIA AND MOST

OTHER STATES, INCLUDES ITS COMMUNITY COL
LEGES. (For example, SUNY has about 200,000 students in 30 community colleges; California enrolls over 1 million community college students in 107

community college districts — but these are not counted in the total enrollments given for either of California's two university systems.)

In per capita spending on its entire public higher education sector (SUNY and CUNY combined), New York State ranks only 43rd among the 50 states. In percentage of its tax dollars that are spent on all of public higher education, New York State ranks a lean 47th among the 50 states. In fact, public higher education is the *only* significant expenditure on which New York State spends far less — per capita or per dollar of state personal income — than most states.

The common charge of the "overbuilt" system may stem in part from the speed at which the system was built up, mainly in the 1960s — a speed that was forced upon this state because it was the only state in the Union, by the late 1940s; that did not yet have a state university. A few of those who continue to charge "overbuilt" reflect the peculiarly New York and New England view that private higher education is inherently "better" than public higher education — a view that I believe to be shortsighted, old fashioned, and just plain wrong. This state is well served by the combirtation of its State University system. the City University system, and an extensive sector of fine private universities and colleges, assisted by New York State TAP and Bundy aid. But public higher education in New York is in no way "overbuilt."

Doesn't SUNY HAVE TO SOLVE ITS PROBLEMS BY CLOSING ONE OR MORE OF ITS 64 CAMPUSES?

BE CLOSED — BUT ONLY IF THE STATE CONTINUES
TO WITHDRAW RESOURCES FROM THE SYSTEM AS A
WHOLE, AND ONLY THEN BECAUSE THE CUTS HAVE
ALREADY BEEN SO DEEP AND DAMAGING THAT SOME
CAMPUSES MAY HAVE TO BE PROTECTED AT ALMOST
ANY COST — INCLUDING THE CLOSURE OF OTHERWISE VIABLE, QUALITY SCHOOLS AND CAMPUSES. It
is important to note, though, that there are no campuses, even after the recent deep cuts, that deserve to
be eliminated — that is, no campuses that are too
small to be viable, or too expensive for their mission,
or no longer attractive to students or employers, or
otherwise no longer fulfilling their mission with
quality.

Furthermore, those who call for campus closure rarely consider the associated real-costs of closure: the waste of physical assets, the costs of relocating students to other campuses (most of them already overcrowded), the economic loss to a community dependent on the state campus, or the very real but hard to measure costs of lost opportunities, lost quality of life, and lost prestige and confidence.

EVEN IF SUNY SHOULD NOT, OR CANNOT,

CLOSE WHOLE CAMPUSES, CAN'T THE CAMPUSES

SPECIALIZE MORE AND ELIMINATE WASTEFUL DUPLICATION?

YORK IS THE COMPREHENSIVE STATE UNIVERSITY

FOR ALL OF NEW YORK STATE — AND ITS MISSION

AND PROGRAMS MUST BE ACCORDINGLY BROAD AND

WIDELY DISTRIBUTED. IT IS NEITHER "WASTEFUL"

NOR EVEN "DUPLICATIVE" IN ANY MEANINGFUL

SENSE TO TEACH ENGLISH AND HISTORY AND MATH
EMATICS AND ECONOMICS AND BIOLOGY AND OTHER

CORE DISCIPLINES ON ALL OR MOST CAMPUSES.

A program or department would be "wastefully duplicative" only if it served no productive purpose on one or more of the campuses on which it was found, and if the state and the students of SUNY would be just as well served were these to be shut down and the students and resources shifted and consolidated. The problem with such a prescription presented as a new strategy is that "closure and consolidation" has been going on, unrelentingly, for nearly two decades. We have not been cutting across the board, but purposefully and selectively, both among and within campuses. Presidents, vice presidents, deans, and the Central Administrative staff are always searching for programs that can responsibly be eliminated, because departments and programs

and faculty lines that are eliminated are the only ways both to meet the seemingly never-ending budget cuts and to fund new programs — of which the university has begun a great many during these years of overall cutbacks. In short, there is already an extraordinary incentive to eliminate any program that is wasteful or unnecessary — which is why some 35 programs have been so eliminated or consolidated in the State-operated campuses since January 1989. Another 28 programs have been deactivated. The elimination of unnecessary programs is, very simply, an on-going process that will continue — but that does not present any "hitherto undiscovered" way to handle the state's tremendous withdrawal of resources from the State University.

CAN'T SUNY SOLVE ITS BUDGET PROBLEMS

JUST BY MAKING THE FACULTY WORK A LITTLE

HARDER? OR AT LEAST COULDN'T THE FACULTY BE

MADE TO TEACH MORE AS OPPOSED TO DOING ALL

THIS RESEARCH THAT IS OF QUESTIONABLE USE TO

ANYONE?

THE NOTION OF FACULTY EITHER
IGNORING THEIR WORK ALTOGETHER AND LIVING A
LIFE OF EASE, OR OF IGNORING THEIR STUDENTS
AND TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES AND TENDING
ONLY TO RESEARCH OR CONSULTING. IS A

WIDESPREAD VIEW IN THE UNITED STATES, GIVEN IMPETUS BY A NUMBER OF "KISS AND TELL" BOOKS AND BY RECENT "POLITICALLY LOADED" CONGRES-SIONAL TESTIMONY, SUPPOSEDLY BY INSIDERS, IN SUPPORT OF THE "LAZY OR SELF-SERVING PROFES-SOR" THESIS. BUT IT IS NOT TRUE. It is unfair to the academic profession. And it does damage to colleges and universities and to the students they serve by making it seem (to some) as though great cuts can be taken, and no "real damage" be done by simply having the remaining faculty and staff work harder. WHAT IS THE TRUTH ABOUT WORKLOADS? First of all. the workload of any professor contains many tasks besides standing before a class: lecture preparation; examination preparation and grading; keeping fully abreast of one's field, including extensive reading, conferring, and corresponding; new course preparation; teaching via independent study; departmental, school, and university-wide tasks of curriculum review, evaluation of colleagues for promotion and tenure, and general governance; advising students; writing recommendations for students seeking graduate school or employment; mentoring graduate and post-doctoral students; and many more — not to mention research and scholarship in one's discipline. plus all of the tasks of grant-writing and other preparatory groundwork for a program of continuing scholarship and publication.

Within this mix of activities, generally common to all faculty, the emphasis varies enormously.



12

appropriately, by the mission of the institution.

Faculty at community colleges and the colleges of technology — fully 53 percent of all SUNY's non-medical faculty — teach a standard load of five courses (frequently more, on "overload"), plus all of the other tasks enumerated above, but with no requirement to conduct publishable research as such — although some of them still do. These faculty, in fact, need far more time to keep up with their fields and to engage in the mind-expanding challenge of research and publication.

The university college faculty (e.g., at New Paltz, Cortland, Plattsburgh, and the other largely baccalaureate campuses) teach three or four courses plus all of the other tasks cited above, including the expectation of continuing scholarship, which may be in the form of research and publication, or the writing of texts and other curricular materials, or the creation and presentation of artistic or literary works.

Faculty at the four research university centers (Albany, Binghamton, Buffalo, and Stony Brook) must produce published research and stay at the very forefront of their fields, in addition to teaching undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral students. Their standard classroom teaching loads are lighter than for the university colleges or the two-year colleges — typically two or sometimes three courses — but their teaching loads of graduate thesis supervision, student advisement, and postdoctoral mentoring may be very extensive. Also, the demands from

the outside — for manuscript reviews, expert testimony, service on national scientific panels, consulting with state and federal agencies, and the like — are also extensive and are an important part of what these faculty are expected to do.

ARE PARAGONS OF PRODUCTIVITY? Of course not.

The most distinguishing characteristic of the professoriate is that it is a profession: meaning, in part, that its members have very great freedom in how their time is actually spent. For those faculty who are diligent and ambitious, the burdens of the job can become brutal: their tasks never end, and they can labor for incredible hours, consuming evenings and all weekends, trying to be first rate as a teacher, as a scholar, and as a professional colleague. On the other hand, if a faculty member has lost the ambition or drive that he or she may once have had, and chooses to get by with minimal effort, the professorial life can be relatively easy, if unrewarding.

What colleges and universities need to do better than they generally have is to find ways to stimulate, motivate, assist and, if truly warranted, discipline or terminate those few who have become hopelessly unproductive. The best assurance that their number is few is simply the enormous pressure on the academic departments to do more with less and the consequent powerful peer pressure on the less productive few, from the department chair and the members, to carry an appropriate load.



In short, "faculty productivity" everywhere in America is an issue mainly in the research universities, and then for those relatively few who may have lost their drive or their pride, and is a challenge to the administration to be solved in ways that are consistent with the character of a profession and with the fact that the American professoriate, overall, is the most productive in the world in both teaching effectiveness and research output. In fact, faculty productivity is not, contrary to a good deal of popular if uninformed opinion, a scandal or a "dark side to the university" or a way to cut further the resources to the university without a great loss to its reputation, quality, and enrollment.

2

ISN'T SUNY STILL A TERRIFIC BARGAIN?

CAN'T TUITION STILL GO UP A LOT, AT LEAST FOR

THE CHILDREN OF THE AFFLUENT, AS LONG AS

STATE AND FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID IS THERE FOR

THOSE WHO NEED IT?

SUNY IS STILL A GOOD INVESTMENT FOR ANY STUDENT OR FAMILY. BUT THE COST
TO A STUDENT FOR A FULL YEAR IN RESIDENCE AT
ONE OF THE UNIVERSITY CENTERS OR COLLEGES IS
NOW (1992-93) MORE THAN \$9,000. THAT DOES
NOT SEEM "CHEAP," MUCH LESS "TOO CHEAP."
Certainly, it should not be an invitation to d ruble

SUNY tuition again, as was done in just the past two years. Tuition alone for undergraduate New York State students at the State-operated campuses is \$2,650, which covers a full one-third of the actual instructional costs. All other charges for room, board, books, etc., cover all costs and generally total well over \$6,000 annually. At these levels, most students require grants or loans or part-time work — or frequently all three. For example, in 1991-92, some 51,000 State-operated SUNY students borrowed a total of \$130 million to help with their costs of college. In the same time period, 23,500 Community College students borrowed a total of \$41 million.

Tuition in SUNY only seems truly low to those who are comparing it with tuitions at private colleges. It may be that some upper middle class families would be happy to pay a higher tuition for SUNY if they had to. But this does not, in itself, obviate the appropriateness of a truly public university, accessible to all at a modest cost, even to those who have the means to pay more. Some of the middle and upper-middle income class even like getting something of quality in return for some of their not inconsiderable state taxes!

YORK'S INVESTMENT IN ITS STATE UNIVERSITY.

SHOULDN'T THERE BE AT LEAST ONE CAMPUS WITH



THE REPUTATION, SAY, OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, OR WISCONSIN, OR BERKELEY?

NEW YORK STATE, UNFORTU-NATELY AND I BELIEVE UNWISELY, CHOSE TO NOT HAVE A PUBLIC RESEARCH UNIVERSITY UNTIL THE LATE 1950s AND EARLY 1960'S, WHEN THE STATE UNIVERSITY TRUSTEES, THE LEGISLATURE, AND THE GOVERNOR PREVAILED OVER THE POWERFUL OPPO-SITION OF THE STATE'S PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES, AND EVEN OF THE REGENTS, AND PROCEEDED WITH THE PLAN TO DEVELOP THE FOUR RESEARCH UNI-VERSITY CENTERS AT ALBANY, BINGHAMTON, BUFFALO, AND STONY BROOK. By that time, the great public research universities of the Midwest and West had been in existence for a century or more and had been among the world's leaders in research for more than half that time. They had been poised to receive the lion's share of the immediate post-World War II federal investment in research and research infrastructure. As a result of this enormous head start, for example, and of far more generous state tax support, California's nine research university centers in 1992 had aggregate revenues of just under \$7 billion — compared with some \$2 billion for SUNY's four university centers and two health science centers.

Thus, in sheer size, total research budget, established scholarly reputation, athletic fame, or dominant position within the state, SUNY's

university centers do not yet measure up to California or Michigan. At the same time, and measured solely by quality of faculty and research output, SUNY's university centers have been clearly catching up, and a number of our departments and professional schools rank near the top in the nation. Furthermore, the SUNY research university centers have kept a humane scale and an allegiance to teaching as well as to scholarship that is unmatched by the much older giant public universities or systems.

For the relatively small, and in recent years quite unstable, investment from New York State, SUNY has returned a bountiful measure of quality and prestige. But we should aim to place more of our graduate and advanced professional schools in the front ranks of America's research universities — and in time we will be there.

More on quality: what are the undergraduates getting in SUNY? Aren't they taking a back seat to faculty research, graduate
studies, and consulting?

UNDERGRADUATES AND UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION ARE THE OVERWHELMING PRIORITY AT SUNY'S 13 UNIVERSITY COLLEGES, 30
COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND 6 COLLEGES OF TECHNOLOGY. Only in the 4 university centers and the

other doctoral campuses do research and graduate education rise, appropriately, to a higher priority. And even in these university centers can be found some of the most creative and exciting programs in undergraduate education anywhere in the nation—in addition to some extraordinary involvement of undergraduates in research and scholarship that could only take place at a research university.

Yes, graduate students carry some of the teaching load. But they are given special seminars in teaching, and they are evaluated and mentored by senior faculty — both to make them better prepared and more marketable for their first full-time teaching jobs when they leave the university, and also to assure the best possible learning experience for the undergraduates.

Undergraduate students who want mainly senior professors devoted only to their undergraduate classes, and who are not especially enriched by the larger scale and heavier scholarly orientations of the research university, are probably better off at smaller undergraduate colleges. But this is a matter of student preference and learning goals, not of 'good or bad teaching," or "committed or uncommitted faculty." There will always be faculty who give insufficient attention to their teaching, in the colleges as well as the university centers, just as there will always be some combinations of learning styles and teaching styles that simply do not work. But good teaching and the quality of undergraduate education

are unquestionably important throughout the State
University — and there is abundant testimony to this
happy fact.

We might add, though, that both undergraduate and graduate education has clearly suffered from the huge withdrawal of state tax resources and the inevitable loss of teaching faculty and support staff during the past four years. Many of the undergraduate colleges that are held out as models of quality are very small, selective institutions with tuitions of \$15,000 and up, endowments per student of \$50,000-\$100,000, and student/faculty ratios as rich as 10 to 1. SUNY is simply not supported at anywhere near this level of resources or faculty-perstudent. Nevertheless, I am proud of our quality undergraduate education, and I believe that it will begin to improve again when the state ceases its budget cutting and begins to restore some of the resources recently lost.

STILL MORE ON QUALITY: WE HEAR ABOUT STUDENTS WHO HAVE NO BUSINESS IN COLLEGE, WHO SUPPOSEDLY CANNOT WRITE, AND WHO ARE, AT BEST, JUST LEARNING WHAT THEY SHOULD HAVE LEARNED IN HIGH SCHOOL. IS THIS WHAT OUR COLLEGES SHOULD BE DOING?

A. HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE



TRY AND TO MAKE SOME FINANCIAL SACRIFICE TO DO so. It is true that the United States — and the State University of New York - has students, particularly in the educational opportunity centers and in the community colleges and the two-year colleges of technology, and even in the beginning semesters of some of the four-year colleges and universities, who would not find places in the higher educational systems of many other countries. Some will not make it through the first year, but will have had a fair "second chance" - and that, in this nation, is important. Many will complete several, even many, courses successfully and leave short of a degree, but with important gains in learning and maturation and a better understanding of their interests and abilities. And many of these "late bloomers," who would not have had such a chance in other societies, do complete their degrees; more than a few with honors, and go on to be far more productive and personally fulfilled because of this nation's emphasis on higher educational access and the chance that was given to, or "taken on," them.

It may be that we are teaching some subject matter that should have been learned in high school. Perhaps some day we shall have to do less of this. But in the meantime, as long as there are tens of thousands of young (and some not sc young) adults



who have a great deal to learn and the apparent inclination to learn it now, even if they "should have" learned it earlier, we should consider ourselves enormously fortunate to have a system of higher education, including SUNY, CUNY, and many independent and proprietary colleges, that can fulfill these inclinations and do so cost-effectively.

¥

DOES SUNY KNOW THAT ITS UNDERGRADUATES ARE
OBTAINING THE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS THAT THEY
NEED FOR SUCCESSFUL CAREERS AND MEANINGFUL
LIVES IN THE 21ST CENTURY?

The toughest questions to ask are those that are hardest to answer. Such is the case with questions of what is educational quality and how do we know when we have achieved it. No one has developed a perfect description of the knowledge and skills required for success in the twenty-first century. Nor have valid tests been designed to decide whether students have, in fact, acquired the breadth and depth of learning they should have attained in college.

Despite these difficulties, SUNY campuses have done more than most colleges and universities to define the learning goals expected of their gradu-

ates and to design the means of determining the extent to which their students have actually achieved them. Much of higher education continues to judge educational quality in quantitative terms by counting the size of budgets, the number of faculty and research projects, and the student scores on SAT exams. SUNY's assessment program takes a different tack. It defines undergraduate quality on results, not resources — of what students learn in college rather than what they knew when admitted to campus.

SUNY REQUIRES ALL ITS CAMPUSES -COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND STATE-OPERATED UNITS – TO SPELL OUT THE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS EXPECTED OF GRADUATES AND TO SPECIFY THE MEANS OF DETERMINING WHETHER THESE GOALS HAVE BEEN REACHED. Each campus has submitted to SUNY's Provost for approval a comprehensive "Assessment Plan." These plans set forth student goals in writing, mathematics, and critical thinking and problem solving along with general learning in humanities, arts, sciences, and social sciences. They also include specialized objectives for undergraduate programs, along with general goals for student social and personal development. Each plan must also indicate the means for determining whether students are actually achieving the desired outcomes in each of these areas of assessment.

AS MIGHT BE EXPECTED IN AN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM AS DIVERSE AS SUNY, OUR CAMPUSES ARE AT DIFFERENT STAGES OF DEVELOPING

plans in place in basic skills, and most show an array of assessment activities in their undergraduate majors. Not surprisingly, given the range and diversity of goals in general education, less progress has been made in this area, though even here, several SUNY campuses have won national recognition for their innovative approaches to assessment. SUNY campuses are clearly struggling with the difficulty of designing goals in student personal and social development that reflect common values while insisting that any value system in a diverse and pluralistic society must recognize that differences are both inevitable and desirable.

SUNY campuses are using a full range of assessment techniques including standardized and campus-designed tests; student and alumni surveys; and student portfolios and focus groups. Annual reports from campuses also indicate what they have learned from their assessment activities, and how they plan to use these findings to improve institutional and student performance.

THOUGH THE TASK OF DETERMINING

LEARNING GOALS AND THE MEANS OF JUDGING SUC
CESS IS ALWAYS DAUNTING AND NEVER COMPLETE,

THE SUNY SYSTEM AND ITS CAMPUSES HAVE

ACHIEVED NATIONAL RECOGNITION FOR ASSESS
MENT. AND UNLIKE ASSESSMENT IN OTHER STATES,

SUNY INITIATED ITS PROGRAM TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE, NOT IN RESPONSE TO A MANDATE FROM

STATE GOVERNMENT.

The State University of New York buys recycled paper with at least 10% post-consumer waste and makes every effort to produce its publications in a resource-efficient manner.

THE OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

STATE UNIVERSITY PLAZA, 12TH FLOOR

ALBANY, NY 12246

(518) 443-5355

