# PERIODIC REVIEW REPORT presented by

# Long Island University June 1, 2008

Chief Executive Officer: David J. Steinberg, Ph.D., President

Commission Action Preceding this Report: Reaffirmation of Accreditation, June 2003

Date of Evaluation Team's Visit: April 2003



# **Table of Contents**

Executive Summary	i
Chapter 1 - Institutional Response to 2003 Evaluation Team Report	1
Introduction	1
Strategic Planning – The University's Strategic Agenda	1
Institutional Responses to Recommendations Made by Middle States Evaluation Team	5
Summary	
Chapter 2 - Major Accomplishments, Challenges and Opportunities	19
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)	19
Web Redesign Project	20
Technology-Enhanced Teaching and Learning	21
Friends World Program / Global College	23
Campus Reports	24
Brooklyn Campus	24
C.W. Post Campus	25
Brentwood Campus	26
Riverhead Campus	27
Rockland Graduate Campus	28
Westchester Graduate Campus	29
Chapter 3 - Finance and Enrollment Trends and Projections	
Introduction	31
Tuition, Fees and Charges	32
Student Financial Aid	
Investments	
Selected Financial Data	
Indebtedness of the University	
Private Gifts and Grants	
University Budget Process	
Enrollment	
Summary	
Chapter 4 - Assessment Processes and Plans	
Introduction	
Long Island University Assessment Report	
Brooklyn Campus Assessment Report	
C.W. Post Campus Assessment Report	
Regional Campuses Assessment Report	
University Library Assessment Report	
Summary	
Chapter 5 - Linked Institutional Planning and Budgeting	
Introduction	
Key Investments	
Resource Development and Systems	
Strategic Planning within Academic Units	
Summary	
Appendices	67

# **Executive Summary**

#### The Institution

Long Island University was chartered by the Board of Regents of the State of New York in 1926 and is a non-sectarian, independent, non-profit, multi-campus institution of higher learning, offering academic programs and conferring degrees at all levels from the associate's degree through the doctorate. Through its units of Continuing Studies, the University also offers a varied program of continuing education, professional development, and cultural enrichment to students throughout the New York metropolitan and Long Island region. The University offers 575 programs and educates more than 24,000 students at its several campuses.

Residential campuses are located in Brooklyn, New York; and Brookville, New York (C.W. Post Campus). From 1963 to 2005, the University also taught students at a third residential campus, located in Southampton, which was distinguished by its outstanding programs in marine science and the arts. For cost reasons, it proved necessary to consolidate undergraduate offerings at C.W. Post, and to transfer the registration of the marine science programs and to sell the campus to Stony Brook University. WLIU 88.3 F.M., the flagship station of the Long Island University Public Radio Network, continues to broadcast from the campus.

Four regional campuses, offering primarily graduate programs, are located in Brentwood, New York, in Suffolk County; in Orangeburg, New York, in Rockland County; in Purchase, New York, in Westchester County; and in Riverhead, New York, in Suffolk County. Additionally, the Global College program, with its North American Center at the Brooklyn Campus, operates academic centers abroad in Costa Rica, India, China, Japan and South Africa, along with sites affiliated with the Comparative Religion and Culture Program.

Long Island University prides itself on being a student-centered institution. It is a large, complex university with a proud history of providing "Access and Excellence" to generations of students, many of whom are the first in their families to attend college. Today there are more than 160,000 living alumni and in the 2006/2007 academic year, Long Island University awarded more than 4,600 degrees. The University's operating budget exceeds \$350 million and its endowment is valued at approximately \$90 million at the time of this report. The University has been continually accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education since 1955, and many of its academic programs are also recognized or accredited by specialized agencies and professional associations. Its accreditation status was most recently reaffirmed by the Middle States Commission in 2003.

From its beginnings, Long Island University has been committed to providing "effective and moderately priced education" to people from "all walks of life." Initially created to provide education primarily for the children of immigrants, the University today is a diverse institution with urban and suburban campuses, as well as overseas centers. Its overall student population is 24 percent Black Non-Hispanic, 11 percent Hispanic, 51 percent White, and 14 percent Asian and Pacific Islander. The University also serves the educational needs of many students from other nations.

The University's mission statement summarizes the institution's nature and purpose. "The mission of Long Island University is to provide *excellence and access* in private higher education to people from all backgrounds who seek to expand their knowledge and prepare themselves for meaningful, educated lives and for service to their communities and the world." <sup>1</sup>

Although the University operates on multiple campuses, it is chartered as a single institution and operates through a single organizational structure, splitting responsibilities between University Center (central administration) and the campuses. The institution is governed by a single 46-member Board of Trustees and is led by one President. The Academic deans and Dean of University Libraries all report to a single Vice President for Academic Affairs in the University's central administration, providing for an integrated academic program across the entire institution. The residential campuses are headed by Provosts, who report to the University President and serve as the chief operating officers of their respective campuses. The Provosts have responsibilities for enrollment management, finance and administration, student and academic support services, facilities management, public safety, and coordinate closely with the Academic Vice President and other university officers. Each of the regional campuses is managed by an Associate Provost. The University's finances are managed by a single Vice President for Finance and Treasurer, and other officers with university-wide responsibilities include the Vice President for Legal Affairs/University Counsel, the Vice President for Planning, and the Vice President for University Relations.

#### **Major Institutional Changes Since the Decennial Accreditation**

#### Closure of the Southampton College Campus

The 2003 site team urged the University to deal decisively with on-going financial problems at the University's residential liberal arts college campus, Southampton College. After thoughtful deliberation, the University's Board of Trustees voted to terminate undergraduate programming at Southampton College in light of the campus' sizable (and growing) operating deficits and substantial deferred maintenance. Undergraduate instruction at Southampton ceased at the end of the 2004-2005 academic year, and the University sold the campus to the State University of New York in October, 2006. Students were given the option of transferring to another campus of Long Island University, or, in the case of marine sciences majors, transferring to the State University of New York Stony Brook. The University made extraordinary efforts to smooth the transition for affected students by preserving their scholarship packages and by ensuring a seamless educational and social transition. The proceeds from the sale of the Southampton Campus were added to the University's endowment so that the funds will benefit current and future students in perpetuity. Tenure was protected.

#### **Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Implementation**

The 2003 site team report recommended that the University acquire an integrated management information system to manage the University more efficiently, and to supply the data necessary to inform both planning and resource allocation. Since 2003, the University has purchased and implemented most of the major modules of the PeopleSoft/Oracle higher

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Mission Statement for Long Island University, adopted January 2002.

education ERP. This \$25 million investment is already transforming the way the University conducts business and providing access to real-time information to support the University's student-centered teaching mission and systematic strategic planning.

# Strategic Planning

The 2003 site team recommended that the University undertake a program of strategic planning to advance its overall mission and to dovetail with the ERP system implementation. After many months of intense discussion and extensive stakeholder participation, the University unveiled a formal strategic planning document, titled *An Agenda for Strategic Planning*. The *Strategic Agenda*, as it is known, articulates a hierarchy of five core priorities, along with a set of 32 key questions and list of methodologies for seeking answers to the critical questions facing the University. Over the past three years, strategic planning has evolved in cumulative, iterative way by a process closely monitored by the University trustees, both at the Planning Committee level and by the full Board itself. While much work remains to be completed before the next decennial site team visit, the University has made substantial, documented progress in all areas of the *Strategic Agenda*.

#### **Other Significant Changes and Accomplishments**

#### **Outcomes Assessment**

The University has engaged in substantial efforts to expand and refine assessment across the University. Although much of the work to date has taken place through the campus-based assessment committees, the University is providing infrastructure and support to enhance assessment of student learning. In 2007, in an effort to better coordinate and integrate levels of assessment at the program, Campus and University levels, the Office of Academic Affairs assumed university-wide leadership and responsibility for assessment of student learning. A five-year plan is being formulated by the University Director of Assessment and the campus-co-chairs beginning with the development of a written assessment plan based on already-established linkages across the various levels of assessment efforts. Budgetary support and faculty development have been provided to assist faculty in gathering evidence of student learning, including, the purchase of software for accreditation management, implementation of a new student course evaluation system, and ongoing faculty workshops and conferences through the university-wide Teaching and Learning Initiative (TLI).

#### **Institutional Research**

The University has revitalized its Office of Institutional Research through the appointment of an experienced Director of Institutional Research and the addition of two full-time analysts. Beyond the standard reporting required for compliance or routine queries, the Office serves a key role in advancing the University's *Strategic Agenda* by providing data and analysis to inform major policy decisions and resource allocation.

#### **Capital improvements**

Since 2003, the University has invested more than \$95 million in facilities that support student learning and achievement. These projects have been coordinated by an Associate Vice President for Capital Projects, who provides expertise and leadership in managing complex building projects. With the assistance of Sightlines LLC, a nationally recognized facilities asset

advisory firm, the University completed a comprehensive physical asset analysis benchmarking the residential campuses with a carefully selected peer group.

#### The Library of the 21st Century

The University's libraries have substantially expanded access to electronic resources through the acquisition of numerous systems and databases to serve the information needs of the academic community. The libraries have also engaged in a process of strategic planning and self-assessment tied to the University's larger strategic priorities and evolving needs.

# **Technology Enhanced Teaching and Learning**

The University has developed a long-term vision for adopting new and emerging technology to deliver educational services to meet the needs of today's students and to enable the University to remain competitive in the 21st century educational marketplace. The University is investing significant resources to understand the potential for establishing online or "blended" programs, adapting new technology teaching tools, and providing resources for faculty development and experimentation. The ERP information system and redesign of the University's Web site will create an appropriate platform upon which to build a foundation for technology-enhanced teaching and learning.

#### **Fundraising**

In fiscal year 2007, the University completed the Campaign for Long Island University, which raised \$141.8 million for construction, endowment, and programmatic support. The current Bridge campaign is tied directly to priorities articulated in the University's *Strategic Agenda* and will further strengthen the University's ability to fund its core priorities.

The chapters that follow elaborate on these and other major activities since 2003. Chapter One presents the institutional response to the 2003 Evaluation Team report's major recommendations. Chapter Two summarizes major accomplishments, challenges and opportunities University-wide and by campus. Chapter Three covers finance enrollment and finance trends and projections. Chapter Four details assessment processes and plans, University-wide and by campus. The final chapter of the report provides an overview of the University's efforts to link institutional planning and budgeting.

#### **Periodic Review Process**

The effort to prepare this Periodic Review Report for the Middle States Commission began on the University's several campuses more than one year ago and has involved constituencies from all parts of the institution. The President appointed a University-wide PRR Steering Committee composed of 17 representatives from faculty and administration from the residential campuses, non-residential "regional" campuses, and central administration. The Steering Committee met regularly to review the recommendations from the 2003 Middle States Evaluation Team's report, to study the requirements for the PRR, and to create a structure, process, and timeline for drafting the PRR. The Steering Committee also considered key components of assessment that are shared by the entire University community, e.g., student learning outcomes, general education, the freshman year, infrastructure, technology, and faculty

development. Institutional Research worked closely with the Steering Committee and the campuses to support data collection and analysis that informed both university-wide and campus assessment efforts.

Early in the process the Steering Committee agreed to use the University's *Strategic Agenda*, described in Chapter 1, as the primary framework for organizing the Periodic Review Report. In addition to periodic meetings of the full steering committee, a small executive committee met frequently to discuss progress on the PRR, to coordinate communication with the campus committees, and to address issues requiring immediate resolution. The report which follows addresses the major recommendations in the 2003 Middle States report in the context of the revised *Characteristics of Excellence* and the University's strategic initiatives.

#### **Conclusion**

This is an exciting time in the history of Long Island University. Improvements to and investment in the campuses' physical facilities are strengthening the institution's ability to deliver on its historic mission, modern information systems are improving opportunities for sophisticated data analysis and decision-making, and a focus on embracing technology-enhanced teaching and learning will allow the University to respond to the rapidly changing expectations and demands of today's students. The University offers solid academic programs of teaching and research and its enrollment base is strong. It operates on a sound financial base – which has improved significantly since the closure of the Southampton campus – due to excellent financial management and increasing success in the fundraising and development areas. The ongoing strategic planning initiative is bringing about organizational culture change in the form of increased communication between all stakeholders, more critical examination of the University's complex characteristics, and sophisticated review of the institution's position in the marketplace relative to competitor institutions. Equally important, the *Strategic Agenda* has provided a strong framework from which the institution will continue to build on its strengths and plan intelligently for its future.

# **Chapter 1 - Institutional Response to 2003 Evaluation Team Report**

#### Introduction

The report of the Middle States Evaluation Team that visited Long Island University in Spring 2003 (see <a href="Appendix 1">Appendix 1</a>) reflected an appreciation for the complexity of the University, its many institutional strengths and achievements, and offered a number of insightful recommendations for enhancing the University's educational excellence (see <a href="Appendix 2">Appendix 2</a>). Long Island University responded to that decennial self-study and accreditation review process by embarking on a formal, eight-year strategic plan designed to improve the University's ability to fulfill its mission and obligation to its students; to enhance the University's educational excellence through a process of organizational culture change and systematic improvements to operational efficiencies; and to improve the institution's ability to make informed decisions about its future. Since its adoption in 2006, this strategic initiative, referred to as the *Strategic Agenda* (see <a href="Appendix 3">Appendix 3</a>), has become the driving force behind every major University activity. Given its centrality in achieving the University's goals and objectives, an overview of the *Strategic Agenda* is presented here to establish the context within which Long Island University addressed the Middle States report of 2003.

The second part of Chapter 1 addresses the institutional response to the recommendations made in the Evaluation Team's Report.

# Strategic Planning – The University's Strategic Agenda

Beginning in 2003, the University committed itself to designing and implementing a University-wide strategic planning process that would build upon the successes of earlier, primarily campus-based strategic planning activities. After more than two years of intensive discussion and collaboration among the University Officers, including a critical assessment of the University's strengths, vulnerabilities, past planning efforts and the external environment, a draft strategic document was introduced to the University community in September 2005. "Long Island University: A Student-Centered Institution – An Agenda for Strategic Planning" (the Strategic Agenda) established the framework for a planning process that will culminate in a reaccreditation review by Middle States in 2012. An organizational chart (see Appendix 4) and communications plan (see Appendix 5) were designed to ensure that the process would be as inclusive and effective as possible, strengthening partnerships and encouraging dialogue between all University stakeholders. The University Officers spent many months after the introduction of the initial draft of the Strategic Agenda meeting with faculty, students, staff, Trustees and alumni to elicit their feedback on the draft document. The current version, dated April 2006, reflects the University's best efforts to incorporate stakeholder feedback. An eight-year timeline (Appendix 6) was developed to show the relationship of discrete projects to the larger Strategic Agenda. The University's strategic planning efforts were showcased for the entire University community in the Spring 2006 issue of Long Island University Magazine (see Appendix 7), which is distributed to more than 120,000 alumni, University employees, Board members, donors and other friends of the University.

Intentionally concise, the *Strategic Agenda* begins with the University mission and vision statements, followed by a preamble describing the context and goals for strategic planning. The University's goals are presented in five Strategic Priorities and 32 Key Questions that together capture the essence of the institution's challenges and opportunities. The Key Questions help to determine the methodologies, which to date have included survey research, quantitative modeling, focus groups, benchmarking of industry "best practices", market analysis, and other approaches.

A major purpose of the *Strategic Agenda* is to nurture "a culture of evidence" supporting policy development, decision making and resource allocation. The *Strategic Agenda* provides a framework for charting the University's future direction by answering key questions about its educational programs, financial structure, enrollment, pricing, and market position. Over the last three years, strategic planning has unfolded in an iterative, cumulative way through a process closely monitored by the University Officers, the Board of Trustees (both at the Planning Committee level and the full Board itself), and two campus-based strategic planning committees. The Planning Committee meets four to five times annually and the campus-based committees meet at least once each semester. Major projects have been completed in each of the five Strategic Priorities. For agendas and minutes of Planning Committee meetings see <u>Appendices 8</u> and <u>9</u>, respectively. <u>Appendix 10</u> is a compilation of progress reports provided to the Planning Committee and the Board of Trustees since the initiation of the strategic planning process. Summaries and reports of selected strategic planning projects are provided as <u>Appendices 11</u> through <u>23</u>.

# <u>Priority 1: A Student-Centered Educational Environment and Programs</u> with Clear Assessment Measures

A diverse student body is at the heart of Long Island University's mission of Access and Excellence. Admitting and retaining students and ensuring that they receive value for their tuition is of ongoing paramount importance. Pricing and financial assistance policies must ensure that the University remains affordable and true to its mission. All expenditures, including those for faculty and educational programming, must be assessed to assure that they do, in fact, meet student needs and support student achievement. A central goal is to enhance an inclusive learning community that supports every student's educational aspirations. All faculty and staff must participate in this vital task.

The first Strategic Priority of the *Strategic Agenda* underscores the requirement that every decision taken at Long Island University must be examined within the context of its potential to improve students' ability to succeed. Meeting student needs and improving the quality of academic programs must drive the development of academic programs, extracurricular activities and student support services. Understanding why students choose the University, what contributes to their satisfaction, and which factors affect their ability to complete their programs of study are also of utmost importance. This priority focuses on challenges related to enrollment management, student satisfaction and retention, marketing, tuition pricing and discounting, facilities, and increasing competition for students among higher

education institutions. Examples of methodologies being used to address Strategic Priority 1 include assessment of student learning, academic program review and market research.

#### **Priority 2: Faculty and Collegiality**

Faculty are at the heart of the University's educational mission and, therefore, recruitment, retention and development of highly qualified professionals is of paramount importance. Faculty and students share a reciprocal obligation to each other in building an inclusive learning community. An improved governance structure will enhance the University's capacity to meet these aims.

As a student-centered, teaching institution, Long Island University is committed to its students' success as learners. The University also seeks to ensure that in the process of educating students, the institution adds value to their lives. Central to achieving these objectives is a skilled faculty who are supported and nurtured. Because quality teaching is of the utmost importance, the University must be attentive to hiring faculty who are not only competent researchers, but who are also passionate about transforming lives through education, both inside and outside the classroom. Faculty and administration need to work together in a collegial manner to create the rich academic environment that fosters teaching and learning. Progress towards improving collegiality is somewhat complicated at the University by the collective bargaining environment and by the fact that each campus maintains its own faculty. In November 2006, the University Board of Trustees revised its operating Bylaws (see Appendix 25) and asked faculty to review their governance documents in an effort to produce a new, all-University governance document.

# Priority 3: Financial Stability, Entrepreneurial Growth and Management of Risks

Since Long Island University is an enrollment-driven institution, net tuition revenue must be optimized. Creating entrepreneurial opportunities, managing risks and ensuring the capacity to make informed decisions across a spectrum of areas, including Academic Affairs, Student Life, Enrollment Management, Human Resources, Budgeting, and Procurement, undergird the Board's decision to use new information technologies, including ERP, to fulfill the institutional mission. The University's collective obligation to use resources wisely demands a willingness to reassess and improve its efficiency.

Priority 3 demands an objective examination of the University's business practices and a willingness to implement change where necessary. To make the best financial management decisions, the University must have access to timely and accurate data and information. This part of the *Strategic Agenda* reinforces the University's resolve to consider all decisions related to University resources in a thoughtful, careful and data-informed manner. It also recognizes that the University's competitive position can be improved by seeking to understand market forces and by responding to those forces in a timely fashion. A change to multi-year budgeting is essential to planning for the institution's future, which should include continued endowment growth and an improved endowment-to-debt ratio. Examples of strategic projects undertaken in this area include an analysis of net tuition revenue (see <u>Appendix 14</u>) and a review of space allocation and scheduling at the C.W. Post Campus (see <u>Appendix 26</u>).

#### **Priority 4: Community and Cultural Outreach**

Long Island University must be attuned to the changing needs of the communities in which it is embedded, especially those which are underserved. As a regional university, there are interdependencies between the institution and the community. The University's relationships with a rich network of local schools, hospitals, businesses, and other organizations are a vital extension of the traditional classroom. In turn, the University has a sustaining obligation to provide outreach, cultural, and continuing education services, provided such efforts support the primary educational mission.

Priority 4 recognizes the interdependence between Long Island University and the community it serves. Partnerships with employers open doors for students to become involved in internships with local companies and leading organizations, and strengthen awareness of Long Island University in its neighboring communities. Political goodwill, stemming from efforts to engage leaders at all levels of government is essential for advancing the University's capital initiatives. The University takes pride in its efforts to meet the educational, cultural, social and recreational needs of its many constituents, including alumni, neighbors, public officials, but recognizes the need to continue to strengthen relationships with local schools, hospitals, businesses and other organizations as they represent vital extensions of the classroom learning experience.

Tilles Center for the Performing Arts (at the C.W. Post Campus) and Kumble Theater (at the Brooklyn Campus) are thriving features of campus and community life. Tilles Center attracts more than 200,000 visitors annually, including more than 10,000 students from C.W. Post and school districts throughout Long Island. Under the Center's Arts Education initiatives, Long Island University music, dance and theater students have had the opportunity to work with distinguished visiting artists such as Lynn Redgrave and Yo Yo Ma. Kumble Theater, in collaboration with the American Ballet Theater, has engaged members of the campus and neighboring communities in panoply of arts, including dance, drama and music. The University's Public Radio Network, WLIU-FM, remains Long Island's only public radio service operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Each day the station's news and culture team produces twelve hours of original programming.

A component of the University's community and cultural outreach efforts includes implementation of a large-scale survey of a sample of the University's alumni base of more than 160,000 graduates. Preliminary results of that research are currently under review by key University staff.

#### **Priority 5: The Educational Environment in the 21st Century**

The competitive marketplace for delivering educational services is changing and Long Island University must evolve with it by revisiting traditional notions of how knowledge is created, disseminated and preserved. Technology, including the World

Wide Web, is an increasing component of a comprehensive strategy for promoting lifelong learning.

The fifth priority of the *Strategic Agenda* is concerned with changes in the competitive marketplace for delivering educational services. Because technology is reshaping the way faculty teach and students learn, the challenge for the University is to re-examine concepts such as the transfer of knowledge and determine which new tools can help support and expand the University's commitment to student-centered learning. Technology is also rapidly changing the concept of the campus library, and the University must exercise strategic judgment in the investment of new and emerging technologies. The University's Vice President for Academic Affairs has prepared a position paper offering a conceptual and organizational framework necessary for addressing these fundamental issues in the years ahead. "New Modes of Learning: Technology and Teaching at Long Island University for the 21st Century" (see Appendix 27) makes clear that the University must transform its current educational environment through the use of online and/or "blended" programs, new teaching tools, and a library "information commons". Included in Strategic Priority 5 is a systematic reassessment of the University's library system (see Appendix 28).

# **Institutional Responses to Recommendations Made by Middle States Evaluation Team**

# Recommendation 1: Goals and Objectives for Academic Units

The University, through the offices of the Vice President for Planning and Academic Affairs, initiated a planning process for each of the schools and colleges across the University. Each year, the deans provide the goals and objectives for their respective academic units (see Appendix 24). The deans have worked with the Vice President for Planning to refine their skills in setting objectives congruent with the University's *Strategic Agenda* (see Appendix 29) so that benchmarks are established and progress measured. The deans meet with the Vice President for Academic Affairs to review the year's efforts. The process itself is also in review and will continue to be refined in the years ahead.

#### **Recommendation 2: Student Communication**

A great number of communication initiatives have been implemented at the campuses and are summarized in detail in <u>Appendices 30</u> and <u>31</u>. Since the Middle States visit, the Brooklyn and C.W. Post campuses instituted real-time electronic communication procedures for communicating with all students in the event of a campus emergency. The 3n (National Notification Network) Emergency Alert System notifies students, faculty, and staff by text message, e-mail, instant messaging, and/or phone when events critical to their safety and well-being occur on campus. These systems augment the existing methods for communicating with students about routine academic and extracurricular matters.

#### **Recommendation 3: Condition of Residence Hall Facilities**

At the Brooklyn Campus, the demand for housing continues to grow. The University responded in part, by renovating a residential space in 2006 to accommodate an additional 140 students. In January 2008, plans to lodge an additional 220 students in apartments on Fulton

Street across from Flatbush Avenue, were formulated. Conolly Hall, the Campus's residential dormitory housing 700 students, has undergone approximately \$5 million in renovations and improvements over the last five years, including a Life Safety Program and telecommunication system, sprinklers, a new cafeteria and kitchen, air conditioning, and a new roof and food service. The assessment of the impact of these changes on student life and learning is underway.

The C.W. Post Campus has improved and renovated its residence halls, and has invested \$1.3 million in upgrades and repairs. Post Hall, a residence hall that had been converted to office space, was completely renovated and put back into use as a student residence. All buildings received new front doors with electronic locking systems and the campus completed its multi-year plan to install new windows and screens on all dorms. Fire alarm systems have been upgraded and the installation of fire sprinklers in residence halls without sprinklers will begin in Summer 2008. The campus is developing a plan to renovate the bathrooms and replace flooring and beds in all residence halls. Twelve shower areas in the Quad dormitories were renovated. Additional work completed in the residence hall buildings includes the replacement of old carpeting and furniture, a new laundry facility and kitchenette, new stoops and railings, and painting. Additionally, all fire alarms were upgraded in the South Residence Complex and Quad dormitories. Thirty fan coil units (heat/air conditioning units) were installed in Brookville Hall and five bathrooms in the Quad dorms were renovated.

#### **Recommendation 4: Condition of Academic Facilities**

Academic facilities at the Brooklyn Campus have been enhanced by a full-scale renovation of the entire cellar and first floor levels of the Humanities building – the most intensely used academic building on campus. This project created the Kumble Theater for the Performing Arts and Humanities Gallery, which includes an art gallery for students and faculty to exhibit work, two dance studios, a performing arts theater with state-of-the-art electronics and a seating capacity of 320 persons, a separate Black Box theater and performing space and 12 music practice rooms, four music classrooms and a multipurpose concert room. In September 2006 the 112,000-square foot Wellness, Recreation and Athletic Center (WRAC) building opened in phases with modern fitness and health facilities and a plan to introduce communityoriented services. The campus was further revitalized by a new Media Arts and Writing center in the Humanities building followed by a complete renovation of the Campus Plaza, a project which added more than an acre of much-needed green space and more than 150 different plants and trees to the campus courtyard. Additionally, infrastructure projects such as building envelope improvements (roofing and exterior walls) and electrical system upgrade projects have been implemented. The campus is looking at "Green" design and construction projects to minimize the overall carbon footprint contribution. A detailed discussion of the facilities improvements at the Brooklyn Campus is provided in Appendix 32.

Students and faculty arriving at the C.W. Post Campus at the start of the 2003/2004 academic year were welcomed by a reconfigured and renovated main floor of the campus library. The College of Management opened a new MBA suite on the second floor of the library, bringing its facility into the twenty-first century. The work at the library building was complemented by renovation to the Tilles Center Atrium. This project, arguably at the cultural center of both the campus and the surrounding community, introduced a large, impressive new entrance, meeting rooms, and renovation to the 2,250 seat facility. Upon completion of the Tilles

Center project, the previous Conolly gymnasium was converted and redesigned to become the Patsy and Al Kahn Discovery Center, the most modern classroom teaching and studio space on campus. As an accompaniment to these projects, the infrastructure of the campus has been undergoing renovation as well in the form of new hot and chilled water system piping and equipment, exterior envelope projects and electrical service upgrades. Individual science laboratory and classroom projects have been undertaken as envelope work was completed. The campus plans to upgrade life safety systems and infrastructure in its most aged buildings. A detailed discussion of facilities improvements at the C.W. Post Campus is provided in Appendix 33.

#### Recommendation 5: Programs for Students at Risk

Long Island University's mission is one of "Access and Excellence," the institution is committed to providing the needed resources to preserve the success and efficiency of programs that assist at-risk students. At the Brooklyn Campus those services include HEOP, the Writing Center, the Academic Reinforcement Center, the Mathematics Center, the Academic Advisement Center, Achievement Studies, the Psychological Services Center, and SPAN, the funded tutoring program for all students who require help in biology and chemistry. Therefore, the institution will continue to regard as one of its highest priorities the required allocation of funds to insure the success of these academic reinforcement programs. The Brooklyn Campus is currently involved in planning and implementing new programs that will continue to strengthen its capacity to provide educational support for entering students who are deficient in the areas of literacy and mathematics. For example, the relatively new English Summer Institute, which is offered to incoming freshmen who have placed into developmental English courses, provides extensive literacy tutoring to participating students. Students who complete the program are retested for potential placement into core English courses. A similar undertaking for mathematics is currently under review.

In May 2004, the Learning Support Programs at the C.W. Post Campus, which consisted of the Program for Academic Success (PAS), College 101, and the C.W. Post Tutoring Program, were merged with the Academic Resource Center to create the Learning Support Center. Some of these changes were made in response to student sensitivities about being "identified" as being in need of support services. In September of 2005, Disabilities Support Service became a part of the Learning Support Center.

The Program for Academic Success is a one-year academic program for freshmen who meet some, but not all of the campus' admissions requirements. All PAS students who are placed on L level (the highest) probation are required to meet weekly with a Program administrator to ensure that the student is working towards meeting the goals that the Academic Standing Committee has outlined in the student's probation letter. Class attendance and assignment completion are monitored. Because many PAS students have declared majors for which they are not academically suited, a new policy requires PAS students to remain undeclared while they are in the program. They may choose and explore a major, but they must wait to declare the major until they exit the Program. This helps to keep students from being placed on probation and subsequently dismissed for low grade point average in their major. Because they enter the University on probation, PAS students may be dismissed after one year. The general population is given two years before they can be dismissed or suspended. The goal of this initiative is to

improve student retention; assessment of the PAS program is discussed in Chapter 4. The campus initiated a workshop to assist faculty teaching in the Program to make the required tutorial lab hour more meaningful. Other support programs for students at risk at the C.W. Post Campus are described more fully in <u>Appendix 34</u>.

#### **Recommendation 6: Cross-Campus Student Interaction**

Access across campuses ensures that all students at Long Island University have choices about the kinds of learning experiences that meet their needs. Achieving this goal requires that the Brooklyn and C.W. Post faculties and staff develop educational opportunities that enhance student access to the full spectrum of the University's offerings. For example, the relatively new Master's of Social Work program, a collaborative effort between the Brooklyn and C.W. Post campuses, offers courses at both locations, some through telecommunication technology, affording students access to the breadth and depth of faculty expertise across the University. This kind of cross-campus programmatic partnership serves as a model for future collaborative efforts.

The University continues to seek ways in which students at the Brooklyn and C.W. Post campuses can take full advantage of and benefit from the many cultural activities offered at both campuses. Examples of activities that brought students together from both campuses include: C.W. Post and Brooklyn campus students' attendance at performances at the Kumble Theatre and Tilles Center; participation of more than 100 student leaders from both campuses at an annual meeting for three days of leadership workshops, networking and brainstorming. The campus radio stations also share programming. Furthermore, the Brooklyn Campus Honors Program offered a course abroad in Ireland that enrolled students from both campuses. The annual Etiquette Banquet is attended by students from both campuses and the annual Student Affairs dinner, hosted by the Board of Trustees, enables Trustees to meet student leaders from both campuses. Finally, the Student Government/Media roundtable engages student leaders on both campuses in a discussion of relevant student campus issues.

#### **Recommendation 7: Cross-Campus Faculty Collaboration**

One of the strategic priorities on the Long Island University strategic planning agenda is "Faculty and Collegiality." To support the university's aim of promoting intentional and meaningful cross-campus interaction among Long Island University faculty, the Office of Academic Affairs sponsors the university-wide Teaching and Learning Initiative (TLI) and the associated Teaching with Technology Initiative (TTI). Through numerous events and activities coordinated by the TLI Advisory Committee and Office of Academic Affairs, the University supports faculty in their development as effective teachers and scholars, encourages their participation in the life of the University beyond the classroom, and fosters innovative curricular development. For example, each academic year, the TLI sponsors a University-wide teaching conference featuring prominent guest speakers/presenters, as well as a series of faculty-led Brown Bag Lunches at the Brooklyn and C.W. Post Campuses on various topics related to college teaching and learning. Similarly, the TTI sponsors an annual three-day Summer Teaching with Technology Institute, which alternates between the Brooklyn and C.W. Post Campuses, as well as a one-day TTI workshop at each of the two campuses.

A number of recent cross-campus faculty collaborations were forged as a direct result of their participation in TLI and TTI events. The first is a newly registered, blended format Bilingual Education Advanced Certificate program developed and offered jointly by faculty at the Brooklyn and Westchester Graduate Campuses. Another is a series of faculty development workshops offered jointly by the respective Directors of the WAC programs at the Brooklyn and C.W. Post Campuses. A third example of cross-campus faculty collaboration is the formation of two new Faculty Learning Communities on Blended Learning and Moodle, respectively, which are also populated by faculty members from the Brooklyn and C.W. Post Campuses. The TLI and TTI purposefully connect faculty across the University, allowing them to share information on pedagogy within and across the academic disciplines, new applications and tools in instructional technology, and their expertise as teachers and scholars. University faculty members also participate in a number of other formal University-wide interactions, including the annual New Faculty Orientation; annual Sabbatical Research Presentations, and the annual award ceremony for the University's highest faculty honors, the Abraham Krasnoff Memorial Awards for Scholarly Achievement and the David Newton Awards for Teaching Excellence.

Another major University-wide initiative designed to promote cross-campus faculty communication and collaboration is the Presidential Faculty Forums, which began in 2004-2005. The Forums are coordinated by the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of the President. Designed to facilitate communication and dialogue on a variety of topics, these open and informal gatherings of trustees, University officers and faculty members across the Brooklyn and C.W. Post Campuses generally occur four times per year, and alternate between the two campuses. Past forums have addressed a range of topics of interest to the University community including the State of the University; strategic planning; instructional technology and blended/online learning; faculty governance, and others. The President Faculty Forums have been well received by the faculty, and serve to reaffirm the fundamental aims of the University as a learning community.

#### **Recommendation 8: Role of Faculty in Governance at the University Level**

The Middle States team noted the lack of clarity regarding University governance and recommended that the University find an approach that would engage faculty and administration in discussions leading to a mutually agreed upon solution for the current governance situation. At present, the University Administration and the campus faculties hold different views about how to arrive at a collegial, shared governance system that meets the needs of all parties. Each perspective is described below; the University Administration perspective is followed by each campus perspective.

#### Administrative Perspective

The University Administration's efforts commenced in early 2003 when the University's Trustees and Administration, and the Brooklyn Campus faculty began working together to redesign a system of shared University governance. These discussions were eventually expanded to include representatives from the College of Pharmacy and the C.W. Post Campus. The parties, including key faculty from each unit, concluded their discussions in March 2006 with a document entitled "LIU University Faculty Senate (UFS) Constitution" (Appendix 36). That document was subsequently approved by the University's Board of Trustees with the understanding that the faculties of the campuses would revise their campus governance

documents to conform with the provisions in the University-wide document.

On April 7, 2006, the faculty of the Brooklyn Campus signed a Memorandum of Understanding extending the provisions of the UFS Constitution to the Brooklyn Campus Faculty Senate (Appendix 36.1). On that same date, the representatives from the College of Pharmacy signed a similar Memorandum of Understanding for their faculty. The C.W. Post faculty was willing to make significant changes in their governance document, known as the C.W. Post Faculty Handbook. However, the C.W. Post faculty did not agree to the system of Board/Administration representation at faculty governance committees as specified in the UFS Constitution.

As of the writing of this report, the faculty of the College of Pharmacy has sent representatives to the general meetings of the Board of Trustees and to some of the standing committees of the Board of Trustees. The Brooklyn faculty has not yet decided to participate in the new governance system in the absence of an agreement between the Board of Trustees and the C.W. Post faculty. The faculty of the C.W. Post Campus has decided that it does not wish to allow for any formal or regular exchange of representatives with the Board of Trustees/Administration to its Faculty Council or its standing committees.

Discussions will soon be underway with the faculty of the Brooklyn Campus to settle the matter for that campus. The Board of Trustees and Administration have expressed interest to meet with the faculty of the C.W. Post Campus in continuing discussions about governance but the faculty has not yet determined how it wishes to proceed. See <a href="Appendix 37">Appendix 37</a> for correspondence between the Board of Trustees, University Administration and campus faculty representatives.

#### Brooklyn Campus Faculty Perspective

Recommendation eight proved to be the underpinning for creative engagement among faculty, administration and Board of Trustees, all of whom affirmed their distinctive commitment to resolving their differences and creating a framework for governance that would provide immediacy and power to influence decision-making to all stake holders. In the years following the Self-Study, significant progress was made, and, by the end of the 2005-2006 academic year, the Board of Trustees and the Governance Committees of the Brooklyn, C.W. Post, and Pharmacy faculties concluded their discussions with an agreement to revive the University Faculty Senate. An operational document, University Faculty Senate (UFS) Constitution, was presented to and ratified by the Board of Trustees; also presented to and accepted by the Board was a separate Memorandum of Understanding, enumerating specific rights and responsibilities as they applied to the faculty committees of the Brooklyn Campus.

Even as the process moved forward at Brooklyn, the C.W. Post faculty, after having accepted UFS Constitution, has yet to adopt its own Memorandum of Understanding. Without this document, the principle of reciprocity, i.e., faculty representation on Board committees and Administration representation on faculty committees, is not workable. Also problematic to the Brooklyn Campus faculty is the Board's position that Board designees, e.g., University Officers, represent the Board at Brooklyn Campus Senate committee meetings. Clearly, these two concerns must be resolved before governance becomes operational across the University.

Without question, substantial steps forward have been taken, and the Brooklyn Campus faculty is convinced that the remaining outstanding issues are not intractable and that the only viable approach is the continued dialogue that now exists between the Board and the faculty committed to successful resolution. It is the hope and expectation of the Brooklyn faculty that the University will undertake new initiatives and devote its efforts to finding acceptable solutions that allow governance to proceed.

# C.W. Post Campus Faculty Perspective

The C.W. Post faculty has accepted the principle of a University Faculty Senate; however, the exact structure of campus governance is still in discussion. Currently, the C.W. Post faculty has not agreed to a governance structure authorizing the Board of Trustees and the Administration to regularly attend C.W. Post faculty committee meetings. The C.W. Post faculty and its Faculty Council have had many discussions amongst themselves, with the Administration and the Brooklyn faculty, to reach a solution. Discussions are ongoing. Like the Brooklyn Campus, the faculty trust that the University will undertake new initiatives and devote its efforts to finding acceptable solutions that allow governance to proceed.

#### **Recommendation 9: Faculty Diversity**

There have been significant and genuine attempts to identify and hire qualified minority candidates for faculty positions at Long Island University. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and the deans have been aggressive in attempts to enhance the diversity of the faculty, particularly at the Brooklyn Campus, where approximately 70% of students are minorities. The compelling interests of the campuses lie in defining strategies to appoint competent faculty who can also serve as role models for students. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, who approves all hires, has formalized a process to reach out to minority applicants by requiring search committees, Chairs, and Deans to complete an appointment authorization form (see Appendix 38). The form requires that those participating in the search process identify strategies utilized in recruiting minority candidates.

Like all institutions of higher education, the University competes with other universities and colleges for a relatively small pool of qualified minority candidates. At times, the campuses find it difficult to compete with institutions that are better endowed or part of public university systems. To meet this challenge, the campuses decided some years ago to identify qualified minority prospects searching for full-time positions but still working on completion of the doctorate, e.g., those who have just finished their coursework and those finishing completion of the dissertation. This strategy has been successful to some extent, but more outreach to this potential pool is needed.

Even with the challenges of finding and hiring minority faculty, the University has had some successes. In 2004, the School of Education at the Brooklyn Campus filled four out of six positions with hires from diverse backgrounds: two African-American women, one Asian-American woman, and one Lebanese woman. Since 2003, the number of female faculty hired at the Brooklyn Campus has increased from 47% to 50%.

The Conolly College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the Brooklyn Campus, the largest academic unit on Campus, recently completed a faculty study, collecting data in specific

categories: age, gender, tenure status, professorial rank, ethnicity, and years in full-time service. The data show that 48 or 32.5% of the 148 faculty are minorities – 11.5% (17) black, 13% (19) Asian, 7.5% (11) Hispanic, and 0.5% (1) American Indian. The data also confirmed that the College needs to be more attentive to increasing the numbers of minorities on its faculty; consequently, an intensive effort was made this year to find minority candidates for faculty lines. As a result, three African Americans were identified and thereafter hired for the next academic year, one in Psychology, who is yet to complete his degree, one in English, and one in Foreign Languages and Literature. The Dean of Arts and Sciences and his four Division Directors will use an upcoming Faculty Forum as a platform for assessing the College's activities in addressing its faculty's diversity, developing proposed solutions, and preparing an improvement plan. It is anticipated that the other deans will engage in similar activities with their faculties.

Efforts to enhance recruitment of minority faculty include the following:

- Develop resources to assist departments and schools/colleges in their recruitment efforts with respect to addressing diversity of the faculty. Examples of such resources, beyond fiscal support, might include guidance in identifying recruitment events, publications, etc.
- Develop strategies for "growing our own" faculty from adjuncts, clinical faculty, or recent graduates
- Advertise in minority professional journals. In 2007, the University joined HERC (Higher Education Recruitment Consortium)- a collaborative consortium of regional institutions seeking to improve academic recruitment and enhance faculty diversity
- Recruit at graduate schools with large numbers of minority students
- Develop strategies to support minority faculty that have been hired

#### **Recommendation 10: Role of Adjunct Faculty**

While the University is enriched by a diverse pool of highly qualified adjunct faculty, it recognizes the importance of establishing efficient strategies for evaluating the contribution of adjunct faculty to program goals. Furthermore, the University seeks to achieve a blend between full and adjunct faculty instruction that fosters instructional excellence and academic program integrity. Meeting programmatic goals is necessary in the academy to maintain programs that are current, often specialized, and rigorous. At the same time, there is the recognition that students learn best – both inside and outside the classroom – when they are exposed to full-time faculty.

The University is committed to initiating and implementing practices that result in a supportive work environment for adjunct faculty. The campuses are in agreement with the Middle States team that it is not possible to have a single formula or set of formulae for determining the role and appropriate mix of adjunct faculty at each campus. Ultimately, the campuses, in keeping with the University's mission, seek to hire adjunct faculty that advance the cause of liberal learning and improve undergraduate and graduate education.

In some schools at the Brooklyn Campus, e.g., School of Nursing and School of Education's Teaching and Learning (TAL) department, New York State guidelines, which stipulate that no more than 50% of courses be taught by adjuncts, are followed. Smaller programs, however, like those in the School of Health Professions, find it difficult to adhere to

these same guidelines without jeopardizing the academic integrity of its offerings, particularly because many adjuncts provide expertise and specializations that do not currently exist among the full-time faculty. The new Dean of Health Professions is monitoring the proportion of full-time to adjunct faculty in his programs and is seeking cooperation from the administration to make new hires in specific areas.

In other schools and programs at the Brooklyn Campus, the ratio of full-time to adjunct faculty is often program or core-driven. For example, in the 2007-08 academic year, the English Department mounted 196 introductory core English sections. With only twenty-seven full-time faculty, most with a workload of eighteen credits for the academic year, the department relied on significant numbers of adjuncts to meet its teaching commitment. Nevertheless, the departmental Chair assigned full-time faculty to 73 sections (37%), and qualified master's students and adjuncts with long-time experience at the Brooklyn Campus to the rest. Recognizing the need for instructional coherence in its core offerings, the English Department requires that all full-time and adjunct faculty teaching introductory courses attend intensive faculty development sessions prior to the start of the academic year. Other departments in the College of Arts and Sciences – Biology, Mathematics, Philosophy, Chemistry, and Media Arts-depend on sizeable numbers of adjuncts to help deliver their academic programs. For all affected departments and/or schools, there is a requirement for a systematic review of adjuncts by full-time faculty peer observers, student evaluations each semester, and conferencing with Chairs and Deans when appropriate.

It is important to have in place systematic approaches for evaluating the role of adjunct faculty at the Brooklyn and C.W. Post campuses. It is also useful to provide opportunities for adjunct faculty to communicate their attitudes about and experiences with teaching students. A number of survey instruments have been used to accomplish both. For example, the results of the University of Washington Instructional System (IAS), administered bi-annually, are used along with other assessment tools to determine if adjunct faculty have any impact on improving teaching and student learning. The Brooklyn Campus Assessment Committee is working collaboratively with the Office of Academic Affairs to compare data collected from the IAS with related data collected from the National Survey of Student Engagement. We think it likely that useful comparisons from both survey instruments might provide incentive and direction for improving student learning. To address the concern about adjunct faculty satisfaction, expectations, and connection to the Brooklyn Campus, the Outcomes Assessment Committee, with the assistance of StudentVoice, developed a survey that was administered via e-mail (see Appendix 39). The results of the survey are currently being analysed with the basic objective of developing strategies to assist adjunct faculty integration into departments, disciplines, and Schools and the College. Some of the survey findings can be seen in Appendix 40.

#### **Recommendation 11: Student Information Literacy**

The University libraries have adopted the Information Literacy Standards of the Association of College and Research Libraries as a guideline for their information literacy programs. The Core Seminar class at the Brooklyn Campus requires undergraduate students to visit the library twice during the course of the class for instruction on information literacy. The librarians at the Brooklyn Campus library also work closely with the Writing across the Curriculum program to integrate research skills with discipline specific writing. All

undergraduate students at the C.W. Post and Brentwood campuses are required to demonstrate basic competency in library research by passing the Library Competency Exam or successfully completing the Library Competency Workshop. General library tours and/or orientations are available at all campus libraries, as are course specific research instruction sessions.

#### **Recommendations 12 - 15: Library Resources**

The libraries have been working to ensure that the academic community has access to and benefits from the latest technology that will allow it to access resources quickly and easily for its information needs. The University's mail courier system helps to ensure that materials are picked up and delivered as frequently as possible. The Brooklyn, C.W. Post, and Brentwood Campuses receive courier visits five days a week. Courier service is provided to the other campuses twice weekly. The interlibrary loan departments also work well together through e-mails, fax, and phone calls to accommodate requests constrained by time. To further facilitate the delivery of information to the academic community in a timely manner, in fall 2007, the Post library joined the Brooklyn library in implementing the OCLC ILLiad electronic delivery system to provide web based delivery of text documents for requested articles, in addition to the Ariel document delivery system that the libraries implemented in 2002.

Regarding full-text electronic journals, in the summer of 2002, the University libraries subscribed to Serials Solutions, an electronic resource access and management system. According to their report of August 2002, the libraries had electronic access to over 14,000 unique periodical titles within 26 indexed full-text databases. As of the fall of 2007, a Serials Solutions report shows that the libraries now provide access to almost 50,000 full-text titles through 116 full-text databases. This reflects a 250% increase in the access to electronic journals and an increase of nearly 350% in the number of available full-text databases during a five year period. The databases managed through Serials Solutions do not reflect the total number of databases available to the University community. As of fall 2007, more than 250 databases were available, over four-fifths of which provide remote access for the academic community. These databases reflect not only journal publications but also full-text access to print titles. The libraries also make available electronic access to approximately 44,000 digital books through the Academic Complete collection of eBrary. The use of Docutek's ERes system for electronic reserves to provides 24-hour remote access to material. In 2004 a Digital Initiatives Department was created at the C.W. Post Campus. Part of the department's mandate is the digitization of significant research materials within the University and the development of Web sites to enhance patron access to these resources.

The credo of the University libraries is "Many campuses, one library system." The University library staff embrace the notion that a unified library system brings shared benefits and responsibilities. Two primary, but not singular, examples of how the concept of one library system has been implemented are the LIUCat, based on the Horizon library system, and the availability of subject databases across the campuses. The collections of all University libraries are included in the LIUCat which, in conjunction with the courier system and the Ariel and ILLiad programs, makes the collective resources of the libraries available to any University user. LIUCat provides not only bibliographic access to the libraries' print collections but MARC records for electronic resources have also been added to enhance patrons' access to the libraries' electronic text collections. The libraries have also developed the collection of available

databases cooperatively whenever possible, providing electronic access to a greater number of patrons, and also spreading the cost of subscribing to these resources equitably among the various campus libraries.

The libraries have in place a structure that allows them to work cooperatively and collectively to develop strategic plans to address both short term and long term questions and goals. Through a series of working inter-campus subject committees the University librarians meet throughout the year to address issues that confront all the campuses. Two larger meetings of all University librarians occur twice during the year. Both the Brooklyn and C.W. Post campus libraries maintain Strategic Planning Committees to assess the local goals and focuses. A library-wide Strategic Planning and Assessment Committee works with the University Dean of Libraries to develop and maintain an ever evolving cooperate plan to provide the University community with the easiest access to the greatest amount of information resources possible.

A detailed report describing additional accomplishments made within the University's library system may be found at <u>Appendix 41</u>.

#### **Recommendation 16: Library Strategic Planning**

The University's libraries have a long history of engaging in strategic planning and self-assessment at both the campus and University levels. The library faculty and staff are committed to making the necessary changes to remain a vital part of the academic community in this period of rapid growth and transformation in the field of library and information science. The most recent example of this cooperative strategic planning effort can be found in "Re-Envisioning Long Island University Libraries: Working Today and Planning for Tomorrow" (see <a href="Appendix 28">Appendix 28</a>). This document, which will serve as a springboard for future University-wide planning, represents the library's strategic vision in many areas, including a more fully integrated library system, consolidation and centralization, space reallocation, and personnel and staff development.

#### **Recommendation 17: Outcomes Assessment**

The 2003 Middle States Evaluation Team report recognized Long Island University's varied outcomes assessment plans and organizational structures. The report also noted the need for a greater institutional focus on and investment in a rigorous, systematic approach to evaluating student learning and institutional effectiveness. The University's response to the Commission's recommendations related to outcomes assessment is covered fully in Chapter 4 of this report.

#### **Recommendation 18: Strategic Planning**

The University is in the third year of a comprehensive strategic plan led by a full-time Vice President for Planning, who was appointed in June 2005. Strategic planning is discussed throughout the PRR, described at length in Chapters 1 and 5, and documented in numerous appendices.

#### **Recommendation 19: Southampton Curricula and Programs**

In June 2004 the University's Board of Trustees made the difficult decision to transfer all undergraduate programs, with the exception of certain marine science programs, from the

residential campus in Southampton, New York, to the C.W. Post Campus located 65 miles away in Brookville, New York. Friends World College, a unique international program housed at Southampton, was re-located to new facilities in Brooklyn.

The University President, University Officers and Board of Trustees made a commitment to do everything possible to minimize the personal, financial and/or academic hardship to the students, staff and faculty that comprised the Southampton College community. As of the writing of this report, all former Southampton students who transitioned to C.W. Post have completed their Southampton degree programs. The transition was accomplished in a far smoother and more satisfactory fashion than was previously envisioned and the University can state with confidence that those students who remained at the University experienced a minimum of personal, financial and academic disruption. (Copies of the Monitoring and Progress Reports submitted to Middle States related to the Southampton campus relocation are available as Appendices 42, 43 and 44.)

#### **Recommendation 20: Fundraising**

The University celebrated a milestone at the end of the 2006/2007 fiscal year – the end of the Campaign for Long Island University, which lasted seven years. In total, this major fundraising activity raised \$141.8 million for construction, endowment, and programmatic support. The University's prior campaign, The Decade to Build, raised \$100 million in ten years. During the 2006/2007 academic year the University exceeded its goal of closing 15 gifts of \$100,000 or more, compared to an average of ten per year during the capital campaign. Major gifts from individuals represented \$63.5 million, or 45%, of the total raised in the Campaign. The University moved into a "bridge phase" designed to acquire funds for priorities identified by the campus Provosts and to prepare the landscape for the next major capital campaign initiative, which will focus on building the University's endowment. The Campaign Cabinet was reconstituted as the University Relations and Resource Development Committee, chaired by an alumni member of the Board of Trustees.

The University's fundraising activities are supported by a robust program of prospect and alumni research, electronic screening and other research such as the wide-reaching study of alumni that is being conducted by Kane, Parsons and Associates on behalf of the University. The study is being conducted in two parts. The first part was a series of focus groups consisting of a cross-section of alumni from each campus. A total of eight focus groups (two groups from each campus: Brooklyn, C.W. Post, Pharmacy and Southampton) were conducted. One group consisted of graduates from 1960 to 1987. The second group consisted of graduates from 1988 to 2006. Since the College of Pharmacy was integrated with Long Island University in the mid-1970s, only graduates from 1977 to present are included. A telephone survey of more than 1,200 alumni following the segmentation scheme described above has recently been conducted and the Vice President for University Relations and his senior staff are reviewing the findings.

Highlights of recent fundraising efforts include more than \$1 million raised to support the Center for Pharmacy Policy to celebrate the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Dean Stephen M. Gross, Dean of the Arnold & Marie Schwartz College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences. In 2007 a special event honoring the 20th anniversary of President David Steinberg's tenure raised \$1.5 million for the President David J. Steinberg Endowed Undergraduate Fellowship Program. The purpose of the

scholarship fund is to permit outstanding but financially needy students the opportunity to study abroad in their junior year. The daughters of Brooklyn Campus alumna Harriet Heilbrunn '32 confirmed a \$2 million pledge from the Heilbrunn family to establish the Harriet Rothkopf Heilbrunn '32 Endowed Chair in Nursing at the Brooklyn Campus. The first occupant of the chair is the current Dean of the School of Nursing.

#### **Recommendation 21: Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)**

At the time of the 2003 Middle States Evaluation Team visit, the University was unable to offer student-friendly technologies such as real-time, Web-enabled, 24/7, self-service capabilities to its students, given the institution's aging, limited legacy technology and information systems. The University's key leadership and the Board of Trustees were united in their vision that today's higher education environment requires flexible, readily-available information, analytic tools, and the capacity to plan with accuracy. The Board charged the Administration to select and implement a modern Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) solution for the University. The decision to pursue an ERP solution reflected the University's willingness to change for the benefit of its students and the entire learning community. The University Officers agreed to standardize practices across the institution and to establish clear, common business rules.

Beginning in 2003, the ERP Steering Committee, co-chaired by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Finance and Treasurer, worked with the University Chief Information Officer to meet with stakeholders from nearly every administrative unit within the University. With guidance from external consultants, this group undertook an exhaustive analysis to determine the appropriate methodology to best provide the institution with efficient, effective business processes and standards. In Spring 2004, 200 members of the University community participated actively in on-campus demonstrations, evaluating the products being offered by the two leading higher education ERP vendors, SunGard SCT and PeopleSoft. After considering many factors and in consultation with key stakeholders and outside consultants, the University Officers recommended PeopleSoft as the vendor of choice. The University's Board of Trustees unanimously endorsed the recommendation and in October 2004, the University entered into an agreement with PeopleSoft for the key modules: Financial Systems, Human Resources/ Payroll, Student/Academic, EPM and Datawarehousing. The Board's Planning Committee assumed oversight and guidance for the project throughout its lifecycle.

#### **Recommendation 22: Facilities and Equipment Upgrading**

In aggregate, more than \$95 million has been invested since 2003 implementing the University's capital plan. This plan entails major projects to upgrade, renovate or enhance physical facilities that support student learning and achievement at the University's two residential campuses. The renovation and rehabilitation of facilities has resulted in improved energy efficiency, better access for disabled students, and greater safety and health for students, faculty, and staff. In a further effort to improve the management of its campus physical facilities, in 2006 the University engaged Sightlines, a facilities asset advisory firm that provides information and analysis that can be applied to an institution's physical assets. The firm measured multiple indicators of facilities operations and capital investment, monitored the performance of facilities at the Brooklyn and C.W. Post Campuses over time on these indicators,

and benchmarked the two campuses against carefully-selected peer institutions. A summary of Sightlines' findings is provided in <u>Appendix 16</u>.

As each campus is physically very different, the University has implemented a strategy that complements each campus' academic mission. The Brooklyn Campus is a compact, urban campus of 11 acres, including 15 buildings that total 1.2 million square feet. C.W. Post, on the other hand, is a quintessential suburban campus with approximately 1.5 million square feet of building space spread over 60 buildings and 300 acres. Each campus is implementing projects designed to help the University better accomplish, deliver and fulfill its academic and institutional missions.

All capital projects at Long Island University must be intelligently planned, well designed, executed at or under budget with desired quality and safety. Such activities also must engage the local community, must meet or surpass compliance and environmental standards and must feature efficient operating costs and the lowest possible costs for ongoing maintenance. In September 2002 the University conducted a national search for a senior University-wide official to oversee the institution's large and growing number of capital projects; to provide critical expertise and leadership in managing complex building projects; and to serve as a liaison between the University and the Buildings & Grounds Committee of the Board of Trustees. An experienced, highly-qualified candidate was selected to serve as Associate Vice President for Capital Projects. The Associate Vice President is based at University Center, but spends the majority of his time at the campus location where a particular initiative is under way.

# Summary

The past five years have been a period of tremendous growth and significant change for Long Island University. The 2003 Middle States Team Report and recommendations provided a framework for consideration and review of key areas identified in the *Strategic Agenda*. The University has made significant progress toward its key strategic goal of creating a more student-centered learning environment in every aspect of its operation – from creating new academic resources for students and faculty, to improving its physical facilities, to more fiscally responsible planning and resource allocation that is directly linked to outcomes assessment in academic and non-academic areas.

# Chapter 2 - Major Accomplishments, Challenges and Opportunities

## **Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)**

The implementation of the PeopleSoft/Oracle information management system has been one of the most significant initiatives for change ever undertaken by Long Island University. The Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) project is providing the University a transformed environment in which to operate and demonstrate its capacity to deliver on its mission of "Access and Excellence". As new systems continue to replace older ways of doing business, the institution will be challenged to embrace change; to critically examine the strengths and weaknesses of staff as well as business practices; and to make decisions about investment in much-needed, ongoing training and education.

The project was structured to unfold as a multi-year process, with the modules to be implemented in the following order: Financial Systems (September 2005); Human Resources/ Payroll (July 2006); and Student/Academic (staggered, beginning in 2006). After PeopleSoft was acquired by Oracle in January 2005 there was some uncertainty surrounding future support for the PeopleSoft/Oracle applications and the University experienced some disruption in the original timeline and in the availability of consultants. The Web Portal and Self-Services submodules are scheduled for implementation by the end of November 2008. The ERP Steering Committee meets on a bi-weekly basis to discuss the project, its progress, challenges, anticipated next steps and a wide range of issues, including institutional "fatigue," communications challenges, training needs and staff competencies. At the outset, a budget of \$23.5 million was established for the ERP project. To date, approximately \$21 million has been expended and the Project Management Office anticipates that the project will cost another \$4 million by the time it is completed.

ERP has presented challenges to the University in a number of areas. The PeopleSoft/Oracle applications served as a tool for creating a single administrative structure within Long Island University. An example of this was the need to establish one federal identification number (for all campuses) for the processing of student financial aid instead of the prevailing numerous codes. This was accomplished, but not without some problems within the University as the existing C.W. Post Campus identification number was selected, causing some initial confusion for the student applicants for the Brooklyn Campus and the regional campuses. Student administrative functional units (e.g., Registrar, Bursar) that in the past had developed longstanding, diverse, campus-specific practices and policies were forced to adopt a single, common model for carrying out their most frequent activities. In some cases, a blending of the existing practices was possible but in others, staff at both residential campuses needed to embrace entirely new methodologies and systems. Other significant challenges that arose during the project implementation included the departure from the University of key members of the implementation team, the difficulties associated with frequently changing consultants as the PeopleSoft/Oracle acquisition occurred, and the realization of the need for training and improved software skills among many University employees working in the student services areas. Despite these challenges, executive sponsorship for the program has never flagged, allowing the project to continue its forward momentum.

Although all major modules have been installed, the project is far from complete. The University Officers, campus and project leaders are re-examining business processes that worked well in the legacy mainframe system, but are less successful in the PeopleSoft/Oracle environment. The University is actively trying to recruit staff with the particular skills set that can strengthen those functional offices that are most dependent upon the new information system. Bringing the Student Portal/Self-Services sub-module online is one of the highest priorities for the University in the current year. This project represents an opportunity to empower students as they begin to use the software to manage their academic careers in a more responsive and timely fashion than was possible under the legacy systems. Furthermore, it is an essential element in reaching the goals of the *Strategic Agenda*.

The Student Portal/Self-Services project will be implemented in phases with the goal of Graduate Self-Service becoming operational for the Spring 2009 term and Undergraduate Self-Service operational in Fall 2009. Specifically, the project will transform the following student service areas:

- Admissions Students who have applied to the University online will be able to monitor the status of their application throughout the process. Additionally, students will be able to submit credentials electronically and receive notification about their application.
- Student Records Students will be able to register for classes online and will be able to perform other transactions such as adding or dropping classes, requesting transcripts, changing addresses, *et cetera*.
- Student Financial Assistance Students will be able to view their financial aid accounts in order to determine the types of aid available and whether such aid has been disbursed to their accounts.
- Student Finance (Bursar) Students will be able to view their accounts and make electronic payments to the University. Students can also determine whether blocks have been placed on their accounts.

#### Web Redesign Project

As a *de facto* standard communications medium, the World Wide Web is a key element in helping to achieve many of the goals of the *Strategic Agenda*. Specifically, the University's Web site needs to differentiate Long Island University clearly and compellingly from its competitors, and must be well organized, readily navigable, intuitive and dynamic. In Spring 2006 the University engaged a marketing consultant firm to conduct interviews and focus groups with stakeholders representing all areas of the University. The Needs Assessment report (Appendix 45) that resulted from that work provided insights into the strengths and weaknesses of the University's existing Web site and laid out the objectives and parameters for a Web redesign project. There was strong consensus within the University that the institution's current Web site needed to be updated to a level of capability that would be highly responsive to current and prospective students and other stakeholders. Later that year the University issued a Request for Proposal for Web redesign services. In Fall 2006 the University retained BigBad, Inc. (see Appendix 46) a national leader in the redesign of college Web sites to help achieve its goals of

meeting the diverse needs of many audiences, including prospective students and their parents, current students, alumni, faculty, guidance counselors, employees and friends of the University. Since then, the engagement of many members of the University community has enabled the core project team to develop an intimate understanding of stakeholders' needs and expectations. BigBad has worked with the University-wide Web Redesign Committee, key administrators, Board members, students and faculty to create an initial design for a Web site that will enhance the experience of those who visit the site. The result of these efforts is an engaging, user-friendly interface that conveys the breadth and depth of the University and the value of its programs and services. (Draft versions of the initial design proposals can be seen in Appendix 47.)

In Spring 2008 the project team will finalize the wire frames that will serve as the structural base for the Brooklyn and the C.W. Post Campus homepages and will flesh out the design comps. These comps will also go through a thorough review process that will also include student focus groups. The project team has worked to restructure the information architecture of the Web site to enable users to quickly find desired information. Schematic representations have been completed for the University's "umbrella" site, and for the Brooklyn and the C.W. Post Campus sites. The next step will involve implementing the revised site design and information architecture with the University's new content management system. The project will be implemented in three phases (see Appendix 48). The target release date for the University "umbrella" pages, the Brooklyn Campus pages and the C.W. Post Campus pages is July 2009. The anticipated release date for the four regional campuses is August 2009. Finally, in September 2009, the new sites for the College of Pharmacy and Global College will be released. Implementation and integration of additional University sub-sites with the new design and CMS infrastructure will be considered and scheduled for completion following the final phase.

#### **Technology-Enhanced Teaching and Learning**

The ongoing implementation and development of the PeopleSoft/Oracle information systems and the redesign of the University's Web site are helping to create an appropriate context and infrastructure upon which to build a robust foundation for technology-enhanced teaching and learning at Long Island University. Over the past several years Long Island University has developed a long-term vision for adopting new and emerging technologies to deliver educational services in a way that meets the needs and demands of today's students, and, simultaneously, helps the University to maintain its competitive edge in the changing marketplace of the 21st century. This goal is in keeping with Strategic Priority 5 of the University's Strategic Agenda, which makes clear that Long Island University must transform its current educational environment. Toward that end, the University has produced a template for moving forward with its plans: "New Modes of Learning: Technology and Teaching at Long Island University for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century" (see Appendix 27). Under the leadership of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the University has devoted significant resources to understanding the need and potential for establishing new online or "blended" programs, adapting classroom activities to incorporate new teaching tools, providing for faculty development and experimentation, reconstituting the library to an "information commons," and integrating the University's resources into a coherent, effective organizational structure. A Web-Mediated Instruction Task Force that includes faculty and administrators from across the University has been created and meets regularly to address these issues and to make

recommendations based on its work. The University recognizes that the potential risk to future student enrollment of not moving ahead with this initiative is greater than the risk the institution might assume in exploring the possibilities afforded by Web-mediated instruction.

Specific aspects of the University's plan to expand its capacity for providing technologyenhanced instruction include: the hiring of an Associate Vice President for Instructional Technology / Dean of Virtual College (see Appendix 49); the development of a Faculty Instructional Resource Center at each campus; a new independent academic unit (Virtual College) with its own marketing, tuition pricing, program development and administrative structures; the integration of the Regional campuses through the use of blended and online programs; the use of Virtual College organizational structures to develop additional technologyenhanced learning experiences at existing schools and colleges; an integrated system to support faculty development, student support services and program development; the development of online and blended programs at the graduate level; and experimentation, such as with the Homeland Security program, utilizing software such as Moodle or WeaveOnline. The initiative to embrace Web-mediated technologies more fully will require an ongoing financial investment that cannot be easily quantified at the present time. The University has, however, conducted some preliminary market research and assessed estimated initial costs associated with establishing the requisite instructional technology infrastructure and human resources. The University's Office of Information Technology has been working closely with Academic Affairs to develop these plans.

The new Associate Vice President for Instructional Technology and Dean of Virtual College will assume a leadership role in implementing the new initiative, beginning with a critical assessment of the University's strengths and weaknesses and planning next steps. The scope and magnitude of this project will demand sophisticated project management, long-term planning, executive sponsorship and close oversight. The Virtual College will not create competition within the University for student enrollment because the University will offer online and blended study opportunities in programs that it does not currently offer; the new unit will focus on graduate programs.

In addition to recruiting an Associate Vice President and Dean of Virtual College, the University's next steps include refining the institutional vision for campus-based Faculty Instructional Resource Centers; developing a plan for the reorganization of the University's library system; examining the need for additional support staff in the area of academic instructional technology; expanding the existing Student Help Desk support functions; and creating an organizational structure that establishes the Regional campuses as a discrete academic unit within the University, a development that will allow them to operate without the constraints of the existing collective bargaining agreements. The new Associate Vice President is expected to bring much-needed knowledge and expertise in a wide range of information technology and Web-mediated learning trends to the University and the University-wide task force is focusing its efforts on making sure that the University is aware of emerging trends and opportunities for success in this area. The University's plans for undertaking this long-term endeavor were presented to the Planning Committee of the Board of Trustees and the full Board in April 2008.

#### Friends World Program / Global College

As part of the relocation of undergraduate programming from the Southampton campus, the Friends World Program, a unique international program, was re-located to new facilities near the Brooklyn Campus in September 2005. The change in location created a number of short-term technological, administrative and personnel difficulties that further contributed to what had been a steady four-year decline in enrollment (from 183 students in Fall 2002 to 120 students in Fall 2005). The move to Brooklyn coincided with the introduction of the capstone semester for seniors, which was designed to enable seniors, as a cohort, to capitalize on the best of their Friends World education and to prepare students for life beyond graduation by supporting exploration of the students' future academic and career goals.

In January 2006, a series of conversations between the Dean of Friends World, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President led to a decision to revise and re-structure the curriculum, to rename the program, to develop a new marketing plan, and to invest an additional \$50,000 annually in marketing efforts. In March 2007, the Friends World Program was renamed Global College of Long Island University and a new line of marketing materials was created. A five-year budget plan was approved (see <a href="Appendix 50">Appendix 50</a>). A new curriculum, developed in the 2006-2007 academic year, went into effect with the entering class in September 2007. Overseas Global College centers are now located in Costa Rica, India, China, Japan and South Africa, along with the sites affiliated with the Comparative Religion and Culture Program. (The London, England center was closed in 2005.) Though the early response to these changes from prospective students seems positive, a more formal review of progress in meeting budget and enrollment goals will take place in June 2009. The entering Fall 2007 class and a smaller graduating class in May 2008 will likely yield a more typical level of continuing students in Fall 2008. Administrators project a slightly larger entering class and a total enrollment of 116 students in Fall 2008. This would represent the first Fall-to-Fall increase in several years.

Global College's mission is the development of well-educated world citizens, men and women from a broad spectrum of nationalities and social classes who participate in an undergraduate liberal arts program that enables them to combine first-hand experience of diverse cultural realities with the critical study of academic disciplines and human and ecological problems; to test intellectual theories and skills against the demands of practice and service; to carry out specialized field study under expert guidance that synthesizes cross-cultural understanding; and to develop a broad world view and a level of achievement in a chosen field sufficient to prepare for a life of committed action in the interest of the world community. The unique curriculum allows matriculated Global College students to earn a Bachelor of Arts in Global Studies. Students focus on three distinct world regions where they pursue field work, independent study and cross-cultural and writing skills development, while progressing on parallel academic tracks during each of the first three years of their studies. They return to New York for the culminating capstone semester and senior thesis.

In 2004, the Dean of the Friends World Program (now Global College) was also named the University Dean of International Education. He was charged with the responsibility to make study abroad more accessible to all students at Long Island University and to explore ways in which the overseas centers might be better utilized by the larger University community.

Discussions with administrators and faculty at both residential campuses now center on resolving financial and curricular barriers to studying abroad. A renewable summer grant of \$50,000 from the Dewitt-Wallace Foundation and a three-year grant of \$50,000 annually from the Institute for Study Abroad (IFSA) Foundation have made it possible for dozens of Long Island University students from low-income families to study abroad in the past five years.

# **Campus Reports**

#### **Brooklyn Campus**

In examining the state of the Campus five years after the 2003 Middle States Decennial visit, we found a strong, vigorous urban institution that is well poised to compete with the challenges of the 21st century. The faculty, students, and staff are committed to the success of their institution and confident in the quality of its contributions to all who come here to study, teach, and work. The Campus has achieved much in enriching the value of the educational programs it affords its students, through refurbishing its classrooms and laboratories; building new accommodations for its programs, e.g., in media arts and new media arts and performance; landscaping common areas that are greener and friendlier; renovating residence life spaces; and building a cyber café and \$50 million wellness and recreation center. We see these as essential and valuable improvements to our Campus that will not only improve student learning, but also promote the quality of life for a diverse population of students with multiple learning needs. While these accomplishments are significant and gratifying, they nevertheless only make sense if they promote the cause of liberal and professional learning. Faculty members and academic administrators believe that these achievements will provide support in creating in our students a sense of civic responsibility by creating sites where common ground can flourish and where students can prepare to be mature and working citizens. The challenge, of course, is to find the adequate resources needed to improve the coherence between our academic programs and the physical environment that contributes so very much to establishing a better educational climate. All of us at the Brooklyn Campus are privileged to serve as contributors to this calling and share in the responsibility of making our urban campus a center for liberal learning.

Over the last five years, new academic programs have been developed and placed into the curriculum of the Brooklyn Campus. Such programs – including, but not limited to, new media arts and performance, the graduate social work program, the graduate MFA in creative writing – have resulted from the hard work of faculty and academic administrators engaging in conversations about pedagogy, research, and technology. Such efforts continue as the Campus considers potential new programs in graduate media arts, ecology and evolution, and a doctoral program in speech language pathology, to name a few. The challenges and opportunities in new program development in the global economy of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, we believe, will involve finding shared possibilities for integrating liberal learning into professional education on a Campus where both have significant contributions to make.

Faculty governance, as noted in an earlier section of this document, is still to be achieved but with significant progress already made. Because of the apparent magnitude of this issue, participating faculty and administrators continue to examine realistically the options on the table. Moreover, all participants are committed to keeping the lines of communication open and to achieving a practical and workable governance agreement.

Although Campus outcomes assessment has matured over the last five years into an embedded piece of everything we do to advance student learning, there continue to exist important challenges that must be resolved, including the systematic collection and analysis of data to inform departmental, divisional, programmatic, and college improvement activities. The Campus assessment committee believes that that challenge is being addressed, in part, by the implementation of the PeopleSoft/Oracle system, the creation and cooperation of an Office of Institutional Research, and the recent hiring of a University Director of Outcomes Assessment. With the assistance of these offices and a reliable database, the Campus is confident that it can move forward with its rooted assessment program and systematically work to improve student learning and student persistence.

Although the challenges for Brooklyn Campus of Long Island University are pressing and sometimes even daunting, the Campus leaders nevertheless are willing to entertain solutions and approaches whose outcomes are coupled to improving student learning. We welcome the opportunity to respond in ways that advance all that we do to serve our students.

#### C.W. Post Campus

After serving as Campus Provost for thirteen years, Dr. Joseph Shenker will retire at the end of the Spring 2008 semester. During his tenure, undergraduate enrollment at C.W. Post grew from 4,450 to 5,400 and the campus experienced a 62% increase in the size of the entering freshman class. In addition, \$84 million was spent improving or upgrading campus facilities, and centerpieces such as the Pratt Recreation Center, the Arnold S. Winnick Student Center, and the Patsy and Al Kahn Discovery Center have come online. University President David Steinberg announced his intention to seek a successor Provost from within the University ranks by early Summer 2008.

The Mission Statement of the C.W. Post Campus (<u>Appendix 51</u>) states that the campus is "committed to providing highly individualized educational experiences [with the] emphasis on the student learner." Using the campus Goals and Objectives (<u>Appendix 52</u>) as guides for both day-to- day operations and short- and long-term planning processes, the campus has been innovative and has made adjustments as the local and world communities have changed. New academic programs have been developed at C.W. Post and existing programs have been modified to meet changed requirements set by outside agencies as well as in response to our own outcomes assessment processes. A list of such programs is provided as <u>Appendix 53</u>. The introduction of a new Forensic Science degree has been especially successful as the program combines two strengths of the campus as reflected in its mission statement: a strong liberal arts base with a professional orientation. The C.W. Post Campus of Long Island University educates a high proportion of the teachers on Long Island and its programs have been kept up-to-date and competitive. Yet, with changing demographics and State requirements, enrollments have fluctuated. Graduate enrollments peaked in 2004 as teachers sought to earn master's degrees in advance of new certification requirements of the New York State Education Department.

The Faculty went on a month-long strike in Fall 2003 over workload, wages, and release time for research and non-classroom responsibilities. Adjuncts and some full-time faculty taught many classes, but learning was greatly disrupted. After the strike was over, most striking faculty

were docked considerable amounts of money even though most wanted and were willing to make up the class time. Those monies were given to the student government. Capital expenses were funded and department chairs had to make their case for equipment through requests to students. Although enrollment suffered a little in Fall 2003, since the strike freshman enrollments have reached levels higher than those of the past 20 years. Another result was the initiation of the Presidential Faculty Forums which are intended to foster better understanding between Faculty, Administration and the Board of Trustees. In Fall 2006, the University and the C.W. Post Collegial Federation reached a five-year collective bargaining agreement.

The faculty, staff and administration consistently work together to improve student learning both inside and outside the classroom. <u>Appendix 54</u> offers detailed evidence of how several activities have been driven by the Campus mission, goals and objectives. These include: Writing Across the Curriculum; New Technologies; Student enrichment (Study Abroad and Local Community Interaction); Plagiarism; and Non-Classroom Enrichment, including Student Affairs-Faculty partnerships, Honors Program activities, and Residence Life and International Student Enhancements.

#### **Brentwood Campus**

After a 40-year affiliation with Long Island University, the Brentwood Campus Associate Provost announced her intention to retire, effective September 1, 2008. Under Marlyne Hynds' leadership, the Brentwood Campus established itself as a vital center of higher education on Long Island, providing academic programs of high quality in an environment and on a schedule convenient for working adults and traditional-age students. Associate Provost Hynds created the University's first Seamless Transfer Program with Suffolk County Community College and initiated partnerships with Suffolk County government to provide graduate degree programs to employees.

In July 2004, the Department of Counseling and Development in the School of Education received national accreditation from the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). When legislation was passed in 2005 by the New York State Department of Education providing licensure to Mental Health Counselors, the Brentwood Campus began offering courses to students in this program. Currently enrollment in this major has now reached more than 50 students. In addition, the Mental Health Counseling program has also provided a secondary career path for the Campus' School Counseling students who have found a highly competitive job market in their field of study. Many students now pursue both School Counseling certification and Mental Health Counseling licensure.

Improvements to campus technology have involved the complete renovation of the computer labs, installation of a campus-wide wireless network, expansion of the research facilities available in the library and various upgrades to the campus server and related infrastructure components. In addition, the Campus has recently purchased more than 20 Macintosh computers, a classroom "smart board" and network printers. Numerous laptops and LCD projectors were purchased for faculty and classroom use. In an effort to support the growing technological needs of the campus community, a full-time information technology professional was hired for the Brentwood Campus. Facilities improvements include the renovation of several classrooms (together with the installation of new air conditioners), the total

reconstruction of the snack bar and the upgrading of both entryways. Entryway renovations incorporated improvements to the entry for individuals with physical disabilities as well as the main entrance with new visible signage, awning and new electronic locking doors. A new modern elevator was recently installed by the Sisters of St. Joseph's, providing better access for individuals and deliveries.

One of the major challenges faced by the Brentwood Campus is the increased competition with institutions in the surrounding area. These institutions include St. Joseph's College, Dowling College, St. John's University and Adelphi University. Most notable among regional competitors is St. Joseph's College. Although chief among local "feeder" schools, St. Joseph's College has begun offering new programs in direct competition with those offered at the Brentwood Campus. The campus continues to be challenged by competing institutions for a limited pool of students. In an effort to combat local competition and rising tuition costs, the Brentwood Campus has instituted numerous scholarships and recruiting incentives on both the graduate and undergraduate levels. These efforts are targeted at increasing the quality and size of our student population. In addition, the campus is working work with local schools (i.e., Suffolk County Community College) in providing needed new areas of study for SCCC graduates.

At the conclusion of the Fall 2006 semester, the declining Business and Accounting Programs were phased out and discontinued. This has paved the way for the Brentwood Campus to begin offering the C.W. Post Campus Master of Business Administration program, providing students the opportunity to earn an AACSB-accredited degree. The C.W. Post program was recognized by the Princeton Review as "one of the best places to earn an MBA in the nation."

#### **Riverhead Campus**

Long Island University transferred its graduate academic as well as administrative services from the Southampton campus in Southampton, New York, to a location on the Suffolk County Community College Eastern Campus (SCCC) in Riverhead, New York, in February 2007. The primary reason for the relocation was the sale of the Southampton campus to Stony Brook University. Geographically, the Riverhead location affords a number of success factors. First, Riverhead's large population of historically underserved groups, including first-generation college students, recent immigrants and minorities meshes well with the University's mission of "Access and Excellence." Further, the easy accessibility of the Riverhead location for residents of both the North and South Forks of Long Island and other Eastern Suffolk County towns is important as there are no other graduate institutions of higher education on the East End of Long Island. Finally, SCCC is an enthusiastic partner, both in terms of the campus space and services and the potential to develop upper-level undergraduate programming for residents of Eastern Suffolk County. This unique partnership between a public community college and a private University has the opportunity to be a pioneer in programming development for areas underserved by higher education throughout New York State. As evidence of early success, since the relocation, enrollment at the Riverhead campus has grown considerably with Spring 2008 total headcount up 35.2% and credits sold up 58.7% compared to the same time one year earlier. The Riverhead location offers the following programs: M.S. Childhood Education; M.S. Literacy Education (Birth – 6); M.S. Teaching Students with Disabilities; M.S. Homeland

Security Management (fully on-line); Advanced Certificate Homeland Security Management (fully on-line).

Riverhead students benefit from outstanding academic programs and many individual services available on-site and remotely by the student services staff and through the campus' unique educational partnership with SCCC. The core strength of these programs and campus services is derived from being part of a large, comprehensive university system. Students at Riverhead immediately become part of the Long Island University family, with the advantages of the greater University brought to each student through the dedicated faculty and student services professionals from each campus. All of these pieces working closely together give students the high quality educational experience that the University strives to deliver from the first inquiry through graduation.

#### **Rockland Graduate Campus**

The Rockland Graduate Campus is moving forward with respect to its mission to provide quality graduate education in the areas of Education, Business, Health and Public Administration and Pharmacy. All activities that have been accomplished since 2003 have been towards this end. The Campus has expanded its educational offerings by adding eight new academic programs and advanced certificates: Advanced Certificate in Nonprofit Management (2003); Nonprofit Specialization in MPA program (2003); M.S. degree in Pharmaceutics (2005); Gifted Education Certificate Extension (2005); M.S. degree in Mental Health Counseling (2005); M.S.Ed. Degree in Adolescence Education (2006); Certification Extensions to the Adolescence program in Biology, Chemistry and Physics (2007); M.S.Ed. in Special Education – Autism (2007).

Other accomplishments for this period include the establishment of a Best Practices in Education workshop series (2003-present); the obtaining of a legislative grant and the creation of a Model Classroom with state-of-the-art technology, which is used as a classroom laboratory for our students and local school districts (2006); increased active participation by Program Directors in Rockland County community-based associations (including the Rockland County Geriatric Mental Health Committee and the Rockland County Institute for Non-profits); and the establishment of a Continuing Education program (including some courses of both a paraprofessional and remedial nature, geared to Rockland Graduate Campus students).

Campus leaders are optimistic about our ability to be an effective graduate campus, true to its mission of offering quality programs and producing highly qualified graduates. We see an increased interest in life-long learning from our local community. We see our ability, as a regional campus, to be responsive to our community in ways a larger, residential campus cannot be. We sees ways to leverage our professional outreach (e.g., Reading Clinic program; Continuing Education program; student teaching and student internships; involvement in local community organizations), to increase our presence in the community and enhance professional opportunities for our students. We see technology as an opportunity to extend that reach even farther.

#### **Westchester Graduate Campus**

Between 2004 and 2008 the Westchester Graduate Campus (WGC) registered three new MS.Ed. programs, seven new advanced certificates in teaching and two new master's degree programs with the New York State Education Department. The first program leads to an MS in Mental Health Counseling. The second program leads to an MS in Marriage and Family Therapy. Both programs prepare a candidate for eligibility to sit for newly revised New York State licensure examinations. These new offerings required the hiring of an additional full-time faculty member, Prof. Lynn Haley-Banez, who jointed the faculty in September 2006. Response from prospective students in both programs has been enthusiastic and, in Spring 2008 (one year after recruitment for the programs began) there are over twenty students working toward their MS degrees at the WGC.

Also in 2006, the WGC's Teacher Education Program received two year provisional, national accreditation from the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC). The Westchester Graduate Campus offers 43 teacher education programs that are registered and approved by New York State and lead to various classroom teaching certificates and combinations of certificates. In April 2008, TEAC conducted its re-accreditation site visit. The visit went well and the team seemed pleased with the results of their audit. However, no documentation has been received as of this date regarding TEAC's re-accreditation decision.

The WGC faces the same economic challenges that present themselves to other higher education institutions and to the nation. It should be noted, however, that over the past forty years or so Westchester County is an area of the country that has demonstrated remarkable financial resilience. Recruiting students will surely be a bit more difficult than in the past, but should not prove to be a significant obstacle to growth. As a graduate campus, our student body is composed of career oriented individuals who, even in bad economic times, perceive graduate study as necessary for entry into a profession and/or professional growth. Expensive as it may be, our students view graduate study as an investment well worth the price.

## **Chapter 3 - Finance and Enrollment Trends and Projections**

#### Introduction

Beginning in 2003 the University embarked on a major, ambitious Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) initiative. ERP is a \$25 million investment that will incorporate the complete suite of PeopleSoft/Oracle administrative software which, when completed in the next 12 to 18 months, will serve as the basis of major improvements in the way the University responds to student expectations and the way it conducts its day-to-day business. Equally important, University Officers, staff and faculty will have access to more timely and accurate information that will assist in the management of our complex enterprise. Modules currently implemented include Finance, Human Resources, Payroll, and Student Financials. Currently, the Student Self-Service functionality is being implemented with a targeted completion date of Fall 2009. When fully operational this module will, among other enhancements, permit students to apply, register and pay their student charges online.

In Spring 2004, the University's Board of Trustees determined that the University would terminate undergraduate programming at its Southampton College campus effective at the end of the 2004/2005 academic year. The decision was based upon the continuing and increasing annual losses at that campus. Southampton College undergraduates were given the opportunity to transfer to programs offered at either the Brooklyn or C.W. Post Campuses or to remain in their current programs, which would be transferred after the 2004/2005 academic year to C.W. Post. Marine Science majors were also given the option to transfer to Stony Brook University. Tenured faculty received appointments at other campuses of the University. In 2005, graduate programming, which had previously occurred at this campus, was relocated to the University's newly established regional campus in Riverhead, New York.

In March 2006, the University entered into a Purchase Agreement with the State University of New York ("SUNY") for the sale of the Southampton College campus for \$35 million. This transaction closed in October 2006. The proceeds of the sale were designated by the University's Board of Trustees to be added to the University's Endowment Fund helping it reach its current market value (April 30, 2008) of \$90 million. This difficult, but critically important decision, together with a stable enrollment base, a significantly improved physical plant, a renewed and active strategic planning focus, the funding of emerging priorities to the extent possible, conservative budgetary practices and sound financial management has had, and will continue to have, a significant positive impact on the financial well-being of the University for the foreseeable future.

#### **Tuition, Fees and Charges**

Approximately 95% of the University's operating revenue is derived from student charges for tuition, room and board. The table below shows undergraduate tuition and room and board charges for the last five academic years:

	FY 2	2007	FY	2006	<u>FY</u>	2005	FY	2004	<u>FY</u>	<u>′ 2003</u>
Undergraduate Per Credit	\$	729	\$	689	\$	651	\$	609	\$	569
Undergraduate Per Semester	11,	685	1	1,050	10	0,435		9,755		9,120
Graduate Per Credit		790		747		705		658		612
Average Room and Board Per Semester*	4,	715	4	4,510	4	4,275		4,015		3,845

<sup>\*</sup>Room and Board rates vary depending upon accommodations and meal plan selected.

In spite of the obvious need to fund ongoing operations during a period of rising costs for health care, utilities and other basic costs and for the funding of certain strategic initiatives, the University has worked hard to limit tuition increases in recent years. Specifically, tuition rate increases in have been 5.9% (FY06), 5.75% (FY07), 5.7% (FY08) and 5.63% (FY09).

#### **Student Financial Aid**

Institutionally-provided financial aid has increased substantially in recent years. In FY09, over \$67 million of financial aid will be provided, increasing the University's overall (undergraduate and graduate) discount rate to approximately 17%.

During the FY08 academic year, approximately 13,700 students received some form of financial aid. Sources of aid include University aid and state and federal grants and loans, as well as endowment and named scholarships and work-study programs. The following table shows amounts received by full-time and part-time University students in recent years:

	FY 2007	FY 2006 (	FY 2005 (in thousands)	FY 2004	FY 2003
State Funds Federal Funds Direct Loans Scholarships & Fellowships	\$ 15,848 19,439 121,526 58,901	15,750 19,037 127,152 53,979	15,808 25,875 126,907 50,837	16,036 26,836 121,344 47,113	15,908 27,981 117,852 45,034
Total	\$ 215,714	215,918	219,427	211,329	206,775

#### **Investments**

The Investment Committee of the Board is vested with the authority to establish the investment objective for the endowment fund and the strategy to achieve that objective. The objective, as stated in the investment policy is "... to earn a total rate of return over a market cycle to maintain and enhance the purchasing power of the Fund. This objective shall be sought while controlling investment risk through appropriate diversification among asset classes and among managers within asset classes".

The fund's strategy is defined primarily by its long-term asset allocation targets (slightly modified within the past year):

Domestic equities	45%
International equities	15%
Domestic fixed income	10%
Global fixed income	5%
Alternatives	25%
	100%

The current market value of the Endowment Fund is approximately \$90 million and is currently managed by thirteen (13) investment managers.

As of April 30, 2008, the one, three, five and ten year investment returns were -1.3%, 5.6%, 7.9% and 5.4%, respectively. Over time, investment returns have been generally consistent with the University's peer group, as measured by the annual NACUBO Endowment Study.

Annual spending from the Endowment to support the University's operating budget is formulaically calculated to equal to 5% of the rolling 12-quarter average market value.

## **Selected Financial Data**

The following selected financial data are per the financial statements of the University, audited by KPMG, the University's independent certified public accountant. Please note that the University changed its policy of reporting expenditures from a functional basis to the more understandable "natural" expense classification basis beginning in the fiscal year ended August 31, 2006. Audited Financial Statements are included as <a href="Appendices 55">Appendices 55</a> and <a href="56">56</a>. The Finance section of the University's IPEDS reports for the past two years are included in <a href="Appendix 57">Appendix 57</a>.

# Natural Expense Classification (Years ending 2006-2007)

, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Years Ende	d Au	gust 31,
	<u>2007</u>		<u>2006</u>
Operating Revenues and Other Support:			
Tuition and fees	\$ 292,702,200	\$	274,297,575
Sales and services of auxiliary enterprises	24,080,472		22,261,017
Government grants and contracts	14,205,038		14,122,668
Private gifts and grants	5,631,249		5,233,717
Investment return	7,736,388		3,923,364
Other sources	9,651,762		8,855,107
Gain on sale of Southampton campus	6,604,052		-
Net assets released from restrictions for operations	 866,863		1,105,243
Total operating revenues and other support	 361,478,024		329,798,691
Operating Expenses:			
Salaries and benefits	247,122,153		235,580,083
Supplies, repairs, utilities, and other expenses	86,631,785		78,645,609
Depreciation and amortization	12,814,136		9,273,924
Interest expense	 5,281,689		3,574,509
Total operating expenses	351,849,763		327,074,125
Increase in unrestricted net assets from operating activities	 9,628,261		2,724,566
Nonoperating	 4,131,083		5,668,949
Increase in unrestricted net assets before changes in accounting principles	13,759,344		8,393,515
Changes in Accounting Principles:			
Postretirement benefit plan	(7,229,897)		-
Conditional asset retirement obligations	 <u> </u>		(5,690,000)
Increase in unrestricted net assets	\$ 6,529,447	\$	2,703,515

# Natural Expense Classification (Years ending 2003-2005)

Years Ended August 31, 2005 2004 2003\* **Operating Revenues and Other Support:** Tuition and fees 268,928,523 248,908,716 239,101,730 Sales and services of auxiliary enterprises 23,418,019 22,264,264 22,378,258 Government grants and contracts 16,687,497 18,504,140 19,869,980 Private gifts and grants 4,631,156 5,047,987 9,346,305 Investment return 3,814,090 4,588,398 3,636,939 Other sources 9,069,533 11,886,610 13,224,193 Net assets released from restrictions for operations 1,194,303 4,376,777 2,993,021 Total operating revenues and other support 327,743,121 314,625,433 311,501,885 **Operating Expenses:** Instruction 158,585,617 152,801,163 147,983,742 52,776,318 Academic support 56,436,545 50,367,660 Institutional support 44,987,275 45,322,841 38,388,076 Student services 35,465,623 32,756,208 31,255,138 Auxiliary enterprises 24,401,136 23,108,331 22,464,542 Public service 4,241,580 4,343,383 4,480,416 Research 2,875,829 2,684,459 3,149,911 **Total operating expenses** 313,984,073 297,624,033 327,267,687 Increase in unrestricted net assets from operating activities 475,434 641,360 13,877,852 **Nonoperating** 4,044,960 6,697,528 **Increase in unrestricted net assets** 7,338,888 4,520,394 13,877,852

<sup>\*</sup>The University did not report a measure of operations prior to fiscal 2004.

## **Indebtedness of the University**

The following table summarizes information related to the University's outstanding long-term debt as of August 31 in each of the years 2003 through 2007.

Long Term Debt: 2003-2007

					Au	gust 31,				
		<u>2007</u>	2	006		<u>2005</u>		<u>2004</u>	2	003
DASNY Insured Revenue Bonds 2006A	\$	72.600.000		_				_		_
DASNY Insured Revenue Bonds 2003A	Ψ	15,705,000	16	5,030,000	1	16,350,000	1	16,350,000	16	5,350,000
DASNY Insured Revenue Bonds 2003B		22,455,000	23	3,060,000	2	23,650,000	2	23,650,000	23	,650,000
DASNY Insured Revenue Bonds 1999		36,347,141	39	,641,714	4	10,743,962	4	11,786,210	42	2,773,458
DASNY Insured Revenue Bonds 1996		-	16	3,890,000	1	17,315,000	1	17,715,000	18	,095,000
DASNY Insured Revenue Bonds 1973		-		-		-		-		285,000
Other Bonds and Notes Payable		5,203,144	6	6,649,081		2,826,496		2,389,589	2	2,837,514
Total	\$	152,310,285	102	2,270,795	10	00,885,458	10	01,890,799	103	3,990,972

The University's credit rating of Baa3 with a 'Stable' outlook was most recently sustained by Moody's in September 2006 in connection with the University's issuance of \$72.6 million of variable rate demand bonds which refinanced existing debt and provided new financing for various important capital projects. Among the strengths enumerated by Moody's in that report were the University's large enrollment base of over 15 thousand full-time equivalents diversified across several campuses in the New York metropolitan area and good growth in student charges fueling a health three times average coverage of maximum annual debt service.

## **Private Gifts and Grants**

Private gifts and grants for the past five fiscal years are described in the table below.

		FY 2007	FY 2006	FY 2005	FY 2004	FY 2003
Unrestricted Net Assets	\$	5,996,634	6,025,340	4,981,534	8,417,379	9,346,305
Temporarily Restricted Net Assets		1,301,424	619,896	2,644,027	3,122,139	2,338,266
Permanently Restricted Net Assets	_	3,767,193	1,143,156	2,471,002	908,922	794,139
Total	\$	11,065,251	7,788,392	10,096,563	12,448,440	12,478,710

#### **University Budget Process**

The development of the University's annual operating budget is a process which seeks to balance and optimize resource generation (primarily student charges for tuition and room and board) with the allocation of such resources to thoughtfully and intelligently fund the University's academic programs, its auxiliary activities and the required administrative support.

The budget addresses, and seeks to fund to the extent possible, the priorities expressed by the University's Strategic Agenda.

The budget is completed by the University Officers in the spring and is then submitted to the Budget and Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees and, ultimately, to the full Board for its consideration and adoption.

After adoption of the budget, regular reports are provided by the Administration to the Budget and Finance Committee and the full Board, indicating projections for the year vis-à-vis the approved budget, along with any modifications to the budgeted expenditures if any unfavorable revenue variances are predicted.

The table below reflects the preliminary budgeted projections for the forthcoming five years. As can be noted in these projections, the University's single greatest focus during these next few years is to strive to increase the amount of financial aid that can be offered to its students.

	Years Ended August 31,						
		<u>2008</u>	2009	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
				(in thous	ands)		
<b>Operating Revenues:</b>							
Tuition and fees	\$	305,047	319,779	337,366	352,921	369,332	386,645
Sales and services of auxiliary enterprises		25,443	26,715	28,051	29,453	30,926	32,472
Government grants and contracts		14,500	14,688	14,982	15,281	15,587	15,899
Private gifts and grants		6,580	6,580	6,580	6,580	6,580	6,580
Investment return designated for operations		6,971	6,683	6,809	6,938	7,072	7,209
Other		11,723	11,790	12,074	12,367	12,668	12,977
Total operating revenues	_	370,264	386,235	405,862	423,540	442,165	461,782
Operating Expenses:							
Salaries and benefits		253,225	264,110	275,982	288,407	301,412	315,026
General expense		95,295	97,944	102,333	107,154	112,476	118,378
Depreciation and amortization		13,786	14,954	16,879	17,176	17,474	17,622
Interest expense		8,218	6,800	7,235	7,046	6,877	6,724
<b>Total operating expenses</b>		370,524	383,808	402,429	419,783	438,239	457,750
Excess (deficit) of operating revenues							
over operating expenses	\$	(260)	2,427	3,433	3,757	3,926	4,032

#### **Enrollment**

Between 2003 and 2007, Long Island University enjoyed stable enrollment, with overall enrollment (excluding Southampton) rising approximately 6.5 percent in terms of total credits registered (see <u>Appendix 58</u>). Growth has been slow, but steady at both the undergraduate and graduate levels:

#### Credits Registered Excluding Southampton Campus

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Percent Change <u>2003-2007</u>
Undergraduate	134,576	137,121	142,508	146,575	144,278	+7.2%
Graduate	56,132	56,984	57,854	57,785	58,906	+4.9%
Total	190,708	194,105	200,362	204,360	203,184	+6.5%

The number of credits registered rose even though the number of students enrolled decreased slightly, dropping 1.6 percent over the five-year period. The slight decrease in enrolled students (from 18,402 to 18,100) was more than offset by a significant increase in the number of <u>full-time</u> students. Overall, the increase in full-time students was 12.3 percent, but among graduate students, the increase was a substantial 27.5 percent:

## Full-time Students Enrolled Excluding Southampton Campus

						Percent Change
	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2003-2007
Undergraduate	8,360	8,537	8,897	9,160	8,993	+7.6%
Graduate	2,607	2,760	2,847	2,999	3,324	+27.5%
Total	10,967	11,297	11,754	12,159	12,317	+12.3%

Over the past five years admissions have been strong, and the number of new students entering the University has generally increased from year to year. The number of new graduate students increased 10.3 percent between 2003 and 2007, while the number of new freshmen increased 28.1 percent. The strong increase in the numbers of new freshmen effectively blunted the impact of a 17.9 percent decrease in new transfer students:

## New Students Excluding Southampton Campus

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Percent Change <u>2003-2007</u>
First-time Freshmen	1,733	1,963	2,056	2,264	2,220	+28.1%
Entering Transfer Students	1,323	1,275	1,134	1,157	1,086	-17.9%
First-time Graduate Students	1,944	2,375	2,242	2,324	2,144	+10.3%
Total	5,000	5,613	5,432	5,745	5,450	+ 9.0%

Looking forward, one sees that for all of New York State, the number of new high school graduates is projected to increase until 2009 and to decline by approximately five percent

between 2009 and 2013. For New York City and Long Island, two markets important to Long Island University, the forecast is mixed. According to figures published by the New York State Department of Education, the number of students graduating from New York City high schools in 2013 is projected to be three percent lower than in 2007; on Long Island, the number graduating in 2013 is projected to be 11 percent higher than in 2007:

Projected Numbers of High School Graduates From Figures Prepared by the New York State Department of Education

	2007	2013	Percent Change
	(actual)	(projected)	<u>2007-2013</u>
New York City	53,066	51,467	-3.1%
Long Island	36,300	40,459	+11.5%
Combined	89,366	91,926	+2.9%

Although markets close to home are expected to show resilience over the next five years, the projected decline in undergraduate markets elsewhere in the Northeast is likely to have an impact upon Long Island University. Undergraduate enrollment may well decline, but the belief is that the decline will be manageable. In the expectation that a slight decrease in undergraduate enrollment will be offset by continued increases in graduate enrollment, the University is planning for flat enrollments between 2007 and 2013.

#### **Summary**

The University is in sound financial condition. The sale of the Southampton College campus removed a significant financial drain, allowed for considerable growth in the University's endowment, and permitted a major investment in a state-of-the-art information technology system. From a balance-sheet point of view, the University has been able to increase its net assets from \$204 million in August 31, 2002 to \$236 million in August 31, 2007. As for past and future student numbers, the University continues to enjoy robust and stable enrollment and is well-positioned to manage its enrollment in the coming years. The University's *Facts in Brief* publication is included as <u>Appendix 59</u>.

## **Chapter 4 - Assessment Processes and Plans**

#### Introduction

Long Island University's two residential and four regional campuses have distinct cultures and processes for dealing with assessment. The approach to assessment has been to adopt a university-wide leadership and structure that supports, and adds breadth and depth, to the existing campus-based assessment efforts. In 2007, in an effort to better coordinate and integrate levels of assessment at the program, campus and University levels, the Office of Academic Affairs assumed university-wide leadership and responsibility for assessment of student learning. Assessment of academic support areas remains the responsibility of the respective Provosts/Campuses. Ultimately, an integration of data is needed to inform and provide data about overall institutional effectiveness.

A university-wide Middle States PRR Steering Committee was convened in 2007 to initiate work on the PRR. It met on a regular basis not only to prepare the report, but to consider the "common denominators" of assessment at Long Island University, e.g., student learning outcomes, infrastructure, technology, faculty development, best practices and assessment workshops. The newly appointed University Director of Assessment has already, in a very short time, provided critical guidance and support in this effort. Institutional Research has also worked closely with the PRR Steering Committee and the Campuses to support data collection and analysis that informs both university-wide and campus plans.

In the following sections, assessment efforts and changes linked to results are summarized by the University, Brooklyn, C.W. Post, and Regional Campuses, and the Library. Analyses of data providing evidence of the overarching educational and institutional effectiveness of Long Island University are included in the University section. Recommendations and a future plan for Long Island University are addressed at the conclusion of the chapter.

## **Long Island University Assessment Report**

#### **Overview of University Assessment: A Mission-Driven Process**

The University is engaged in a strategic planning process designed to strengthen its capacity to achieve its mission of educational access and excellence. The first strategic priority, a student-centered educational environment with clear assessment measures, serves as a framework for consideration of key measures of institutional effectiveness, i.e., admission and retention of students in the freshmen year; assessment of student learning both in and out of the classroom. The current campus-based committee structure provides the mechanism for assessment of student learning in and out of the classroom; campus committee reports are presented below.

Recognizing the growing need for integration of infrastructure and support, in 2007, the Office of Academic Affairs assumed responsibility for assessment of student learning. Under the leadership of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the faculty engaged in assessment of student learning have been provided with an enhanced infrastructure and added resources to support data collection and analysis, e.g., coordinated activity with Institutional Research, the

newly appointed University Director of Assessment, the purchase of software to assist in accreditation management, and outcomes assessment workshops for faculty and deans.

#### **Towards a University Assessment Plan**

The University Director of Assessment has already begun the important work of developing a coordinated university-wide assessment plan. Reporting to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Morley will further shape the university-wide assessment plan using resulting data to identify needed change. She is working collaboratively with the campus outcomes assessment committees, deans and chairs to articulate and measure student learning outcomes that provide evidence of student learning which will inform institutional decision-making. Dr. Morley has already, in a very short time, reached out to the University community through attendance at academic department faculty meetings, School/College chairs' meetings, outcomes assessment committee meetings, and Deans' meetings. The University and the campuses will build on their existing coordinated and structured approaches to assessment, carefully linking mission and assessment, to inform institutional planning and resource allocation within and across classroom, program, campus, and university levels.

The first iteration of the university-wide assessment plan will build upon a foundation of assessment of student learning in key areas such as the freshman year (including identification and support for academically "at risk" freshmen), professional programs, and undergraduate learning in the major and general education. Current assessment efforts in these key areas are described in the sections below.

#### Freshman Year

As is the case at many colleges and universities, the freshman class entering Long Island University is a mix of students of high, average, and modest academic ability. First-year programs on each of the residential campuses are organized to address these differences in academic preparedness, and several of these programs are, by most standards, quite successful. Not surprisingly, 98-99 percent of students in the honors programs at each campus is successful and end the first year of study with a GPA above 2.0. Perhaps, more noteworthy, however, is the performance of many students at the other end of the academic spectrum: at the Brooklyn Campus, almost 85 percent of an entering cohort of HEOP students achieves a first-year index of C or higher.

The middle group of students, those with high school averages in the low 80's and SAT scores of about 1000, comprise approximately 70 percent of the entering freshman class. Between 70 and 80 percent of these students finish their first term in good academic standing and 65 to 70 percent return for a second year. A significant percentage, fifteen to twenty percent, transfers to other institutions within a year.

Of greater concern are the cohorts of about 120 at-risk entering freshmen on each campus whose academic preparedness and first-year persistence fall below local norms. These are students who are not in a HEOP program, whose SAT scores hover around 800 and whose high school averages are in the seventies. Forty to fifty percent of these students fail to return for a second year. On each campus these at-risk students are placed in special classes and have access to advising, tutoring, and other special services. The academic fortunes of these students vary,

and there are substantial differences between the Brooklyn and C.W. Post cohorts, but each presents a significant challenge.

The wide body of work on student persistence makes it clear that there are many factors that affect a student's decision to leave college. A key factor for a number of Long Island University students is the proximity of several publicly financed and much less expensive universities. However, other factors are at work. As with most college freshmen, the factor most influencing persistence for Long Island University students is academic success in the first semester of college. Recent studies by outside consultants also suggest that student engagement and the quality of campus life significantly affect the persistence of freshmen at Long Island University.

In early 2007, the University, through coordinated activity between Academic Affairs and Institutional Research, began to look more closely at the freshman year, specifically programs and courses freshmen take at the two residential campuses. The immediate objective of the review was to develop baseline statistics for each of the several first-year programs on the University's two residential campuses (Appendix 60). The broader objective was to initiate dialogue among key constituencies at each campus on freshman persistence, which has varied between 65 to 70 percent for the first year of study. Several exploratory meetings with individuals identified by the campus co-chairs of the outcomes assessment committees were held. Individuals from Student Affairs, Admissions, and several academic departments, including Mathematics and English, met to discuss approaches to assessment of the freshman year. The dialogue was an engaged one: an approach was adopted. Departments were asked to review the learning goals and objectives for selected courses and assess the extent to which students met the stated goals. The courses reviewed were those that freshmen typically take in the first year (Appendix 61). The basis for these course assessments was a structured review of a single test or assignment. For the review, departments were asked to produce a grading rubric which defined each of the stated learning goals for the course.

To date, the one-year effort to engage the Brooklyn and C.W. Post Campuses in the above assessment approach has yielded some progress. At the C.W. Post Campus, in courses representing a cross-section of the core curriculum, Introductory English, Economics, Political Science and Mathematics, and the one-credit freshman seminar, College 101, an assessment of student learning was conducted. The assessment of student learning in each course is described in detail in the C.W. Post Campus section. As reported by the campus co-chair, Dr. Margaret Boorstein, the project is evolving into assessment of a more crisply defined Freshman Experience that will culminate in the articulation of measurable goals for learning in the freshman year. The Brooklyn Campus Outcomes Assessment Committee has thus far chosen to focus on engagement as a measure of success in the core curriculum (Appendix 62). Recognizing the need for more direct measures of student learning, English 16, Philosophy 61 and Orientation Seminar are currently developing more detailed, student-centered measures, course assignments, research projects and rubrics (Appendix 63).

#### Freshmen at Risk

While freshmen are closely advised on their coursework, and every effort is made to closely match students to courses appropriate to their interests and level of preparedness, a number of students still have difficulty with the first year of college study. This is especially true of those students who comprise the bottom ten or fifteen percent of the entering class. Grading patterns in courses typically taken by Long Island University freshmen point to a number of courses that remain problematic for students in the tenth or fifteenth percentile. And for many freshmen on both campuses, courses in English composition and basic mathematics pose especially challenging obstacles.

Students at all levels of preparedness benefit from careful evaluation of their basic skills. Recent studies of the efficacy of the mathematics placement test used by the Brooklyn Campus suggest that while the test is generally successful (performance on the exam correlates well with students' performance in math courses), the test can nonetheless be improved upon. The studies suggest possible alternatives. Another study by outside consultants suggests that the recalibration of placement test cut-off scores for various English courses can improve learning outcomes in those courses.

Each of the residential campuses offers programs for entering freshmen who lack a good grounding in basic skills. Each campus fields a HEOP program that boasts student success rates above what is predicted for students with admission scores similar to those of the program's participants. Each campus also offers a program for students who are not eligible for the HEOP program, but who need additional preparation for college-level work. At C.W. Post, this program is known as the Program for Academic Success (PAS). At Brooklyn, the program is identified with a particular orientation program, OS-1.

Each of these programs, PAS and OS-1, has had some measure of success. At C.W. Post, PAS students organized into learning communities achieve grades that are better than expected: a report by external consultants noted that C.W. Post freshmen in the PAS program were 3.5 percent more likely to achieve a first-term index of 2.00 than were similar students who did not participate in the program. In the case of the Brooklyn Campus, these same consultants noted that students who successfully completed a required orientation seminar do significantly better than those who do not. It is upon these and similar successes that the University must seek to improve and extend its programs for freshmen, particularly those freshmen whose academic preparedness is in question.

Over the past few years, the University as a whole has done much to identify and address the needs of students who are not fully prepared for college-level work. The work done so far suggests a number of next steps, a list of which might include standardizing admissions and placement testing and reporting, reviewing the curriculum for students at risk, and standardizing exit requirements for students in remedial or developmental sections of basic skills courses. To be sure, these are activities that are ongoing across the University, but by giving greater prominence to these issues, much can be done to engage broader segments of the faculty and administration in the work of educating underprepared freshmen.

## **Professional Programs**

Long Island University is proud of the breadth and depth of its professional program accreditation status (Appendix 64). All teacher education programs at the residential and regional campuses have successfully attained TEAC accreditation. The importance of assessment in accreditation has increased exponentially. Recognizing the need to provide the campus outcomes assessment committees with requisite support and expertise, the newly appointed University Director of Assessment will provide the campus outcomes assessment committees with additional assistance in planning and coordinating programmatic accreditation activities for the myriad programs that seek and maintain accreditation.

#### **Learning in the Major and General Education**

Measures of both areas of learning are summarized in each campus section. There is good progress in assessment of learning in the major; however, more needs to be done in the area of general education. Both residential campuses have a Writing-Across-the Curriculum (WAC) program in place. The WAC program and the use of a standardized test to measure general education are tools both campuses are using to acquire knowledge about student learning in the area of general education. At the Brooklyn Campus, assessments for each core course were developed using student-focused competencies of the core curriculum and the WAC program. Over the past three years, the Campus Committee on Student Writing (CCSW) at C.W. Post has begun assessing the WAC program utilizing a discipline-specific approach. Several departments from different schools have already developed specific goals and measurable outcomes. Institutional Research is also currently assisting the program faculty at the C.W. Post Campus in assessing the successful deployment of the WAC program.

## **Brooklyn Campus Assessment Report**

#### I. Institutional structures promoting assessment

For some time now, a central reality of the Brooklyn Campus, that is both obvious and important and is currently embedded as a mainstream focus, is the expectation that a culture of assessment will advance initiatives to assure that all individuals are held accountable for their performance. However, we also have come to recognize that, if assessment is going to lead to better curricula, teaching, and student learning through identifying problems and devising strategies to resolve them, it must not stand alone but exist in a broader institutional framework. With this in mind, we have linked assessment at the Brooklyn Campus with ongoing institutional research programs that are directly related to the institution's *Agenda for Strategic Planning*, to the Campus's mission and goals, and to the Middle States Council on Higher Education's Standards, especially 7 and 14.

Using Standard 7, mentioned above, as its framework, the Brooklyn Campus Outcomes Assessment Committee (BCOAC) informs, coordinates, and guides the assessment process for all administrative, academic, and student-centered activities of the Campus; moreover the BCOAC collects and analyzes data and suggests actions or strategies for improving subsequent student learning. In short, it is the nucleus of the assessment loop. The committee, co-chaired by the Assistant Provost and a tenured faculty member from the Psychology Department with a statistical background, includes 10 full-time faculty members and one dean, together

representing every academic unit of the Campus; the University Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs; a member of the Campus Student Services Council; and three graduate students who assist in research.

Also, the newly hired University Director of Outcomes Assessment, perhaps the best source for informing the assessment process, will collaborate with the BCOAC. The committee leaders and members were selected because of their institutional experience, ability to communicate a clear purpose for assessment, standing in the academy, and adaptability. For example, the Assistant Provost, who is the co-Chair of the current Middle States review, is also a member of the Council of Deans and has been over the last five years developing outcomes assessment strategies with division directors, academic departments, individual faculty members, and student services units. The BCOAC is structured to insure that each member will serve as liaison between and resource for, his unit and the committee.

To date, all academic and student services departments have developed outcomes assessment plans and are now moving from broad departmental or programmatic perspectives to developing specific learning goals—although some departments began planning by working first from very specific goals. As one might expect, some plans have been implemented, while other require further elaboration before they can be put into action. The BCOAC recognizes its role as a facilitator and catalyst for outcomes assessment and guides the process so that the stakeholders, e.g., faculty, departments, academic units, and others, are empowered to plan approaches to enrich student learning.

As a consequence, all academic assessment is the result of faculty planning and vetting through internal and external assessments, using both direct and indirect measures of learning. It is important, therefore, to review a few examples of serious, participatory Campus outcomes assessment strategies that take into account particular methodologies, approaches, and associated institutional characteristics as they relate to the effectiveness of the process. Consequently, what follows below is a description—in some detail—of a small number of core curriculum assessments under way, along with the extent of our satisfaction with the process and ways of improving it. For a fuller understanding of most of our assessment efforts to date, the readers are referred to the appendices at the end of this section.

As noted earlier, assessment at the Brooklyn Campus is linked to *Strategic Priority 1* of the *Agenda for Strategic Planning*, along with other methodologies (<u>Appendix 3</u>). All academic and student services departments were initially guided in their assessment efforts by an outcomes assessment matrix (<u>Appendix 65</u>) that was not only both assessment- and results-oriented and emphasized the recursive and continuing process of assessment, but was also consistent with the four steps of Standard 7. Assessments were developed for each core-level course using two major cross-curricular initiatives: (1) the student-focused competencies of the core curriculum and (2) the Writing across the Curriculum program.

#### II. Assessment Measures and Results for the Core Curriculum

The Brooklyn Campus core curriculum is consistent with Middle States Standard 12. (See <u>Appendix 66</u> for Core goals.). A second matrix—the Core Curriculum Assessment Matrix—was developed in 2006-07 for English 16, Philosophy 61, Core Seminar, and Orientation

Seminar (Appendix 67), core courses normally scheduled for freshmen. (A full description of these core courses can be found in Appendix 68). Using this matrix and the American Philosophical Association's guidelines for outcomes assessment, the Philosophy Department has developed syllabi and an instrument for assessment that evaluates both analytical and writing competencies. The data collected from this study are currently being evaluated. The English department utilizes several instruments to assess student writing, including the English Placement Rubric that assists faculty in placing students in English courses (Appendix 69) and provides the department with data to revise course curriculum and develop pedagogies to address student learning needs. For English 16 and other composition and literature courses, the department uses a Composition Grading Rubric (Appendix 70) to assist faculty and help students as they prepare multiple drafts of writing assignments. This also serves as a formative assessment that helps faculty to plan class assignments and sessions vis-à-vis student learning needs.

#### Core Seminar 50

Core Seminar is required of students after they complete English 16. Assessment is accomplished through the University of Washington Instructional Assessment System (IAS) where students are asked, in part, to evaluate the instructor's teaching performance (Appendix 71). A second instrument of assessment is conducted by the Core Seminar program and is concerned with the degree to which students feel they have achieved the goals of the core. (See Appendix 72 for complete Core Seminar Assessment). Of the 296 students who responded in the spring semester of 2007, 79% felt that COS 50 helped them to read complex texts more critically; 78% reported the course helped them to develop writing skills; 58% concluded the course helped them to speak more clearly; 70% believed the course helped them to listen more carefully; 81% thought the course improved their skills of interpretation; and 47% said the course expanded their use of numerical data for understanding complex topics.

This picture of academic challenge and growth for students participating in Core Seminar is supplemented by similar results from data gleaned from NSSE 2004 and 2007. For example, Brooklyn Campus freshmen and seniors performed better than their counterparts at other urban universities, Carnegie Peers, and all NSSE 2007 participants on core benchmark goals, including the Level of Academic Challenge, Active and Collaborative Learning, and Student and Faculty Interaction. (See NSSE 2007 Benchmark report attached in Appendix 73) Other comparative data were collected and analyzed using NSSE (2007): achievement of the writing and analytical goals in the core and in the WAC component (Appendix 74); competency in mathematics and speech; writing clearly and effectively, thinking critically and analytically, developing computer and information technology skills, and working effectively with others. In general, the results support the conclusion that Core Seminar is meeting its educational goals. This conclusion is strengthened by data gathered from a student self-assessment instrument related to information literacy. Of the 383 Core Seminar respondents (Spring 2007), 81% reported using the Internet for research; 50% have an LIU Library Bar Code, enabling them to borrow library materials; 19% have checked out a book from the LIU Library; 39% used the electronic databases available through the library; and 28% accessed the electronic resources of the LIU library from a remote location. Information literacy is an embedded academic component of Core Seminar, and participating students receive in two library sessions information on literacy, assignments to

reinforce the lecture, and an opportunity to work with both a librarian and a course instructor to guide their research and writing processes.

#### Orientation Seminar 1

After completing the freshman OS 1 course all students are surveyed about how connected they feel to the Campus community, their financial needs, their knowledge of the Career Services program, and the structure of OS 1. The results reveal that the Brooklyn Campus must address important issues related to how students are integrated into the Campus community; how they win friends on Campus; how they interact with their professors; how they cope with financial difficulties; how they make connections between coursework and career plans, and why they believe OS 1 should be shortened.

#### Computer Literacy

Beginning in Fall 2002, entering students have been required to demonstrate computer literacy in Word, Windows, and Internet/email. This initiative was assessed using two criteria: numbers of students sitting for and passing the exam. Over a five-year span, these numbers have increased significantly, from a 43% pass rate for 198 students in 2002 to a 78% pass rate for 875 students in 2007. (See <a href="Appendix 75">Appendix 75</a> for all results.) Through assessment protocols, the BCOAC recommended strategies to faculty and academic deans that were subsequently implemented and resulted in the significant increases noted.

## Mathematics Core Requirement

The Mathematics Department undertook a study to assess the efficacy of its internal placement examination compared to a widely used external instrument (ACCUPLACER). Although the study is still ongoing and no conclusions can be made at this time about the relative values of the assessing tools under consideration, early data point to the conclusion that students who are placed into specific mathematics courses by either placement instrument are more successful in achieving mathematical skills in the core than their counterparts who progress from developmental mathematics into the core mathematics courses. (For a comprehensive review of the mathematics assessment project, preliminary results, and next steps see <a href="#expenditor">Appendix 76</a>)

#### **III. Other Assessment Efforts**

Beyond the aforementioned assessments, the Brooklyn Campus has been engaged in a number of other on-going and significant assessments, including specific improvement strategies, admission research plans, best practice strategies, retention studies, professional and licensed program reviews, co-curricular assessment studies, and enrollment profile and analyses studies, to name a few. For a review of the work and results in all areas, please refer to the related appendices: Action Plans/Improvement Efforts for Core Curriculum (Appendix 63); Library Outcomes Assessment (Appendix 77); Assessment of the Assessment Process and Results (Appendix 78); Assessment Measures, and Results, Program Level (Appendix 79); Action Plans/Improvement Efforts, Program Level (Appendix 80); Admissions Research (Appendix 81); Assessment Measures and Results, Admissions (Appendix 82); Action Plans/Improvement Efforts, Admissions (Appendix 83); Best Practices Research (Appendix 84); Retention Studies (Appendix 85); Review of Professional and Licensed Academic Programs (Appendix 86); Annual Assessment Report for Professional Schools (Appendix 87); Action Plans/Improvement Efforts, Professional Schools (Appendix 88) Area Specific Assessment Workshop, School of

Health Professions (Appendix 89); Professional Accreditations (Appendix 90); Student and Alumni Satisfaction Research (Appendix 91); Performance Indicators/Benchmarks/Peer Comparisons (Appendix 92); Student Life Integration Committee (Appendix 62); and Enrollment Profile and Analysis (Appendix 93).

### **C.W. Post Campus Assessment Report**

Formalized outcomes assessment at C.W. Post began as a faculty-driven process in 1997. The structure and processes have become an intricate part of the campus culture so that outcomes assessment in its various manifestations influences decisions and ways of thinking. The structure, committee based and faculty led, consists of a Steering Committee guiding a campus-wide committee. Composed of representatives from all academic and support areas, the Steering Committee meets several times each semester and during the summer. The full campus committee includes all chairs and department heads and meets once each semester.

These committees have developed several processes of assessment of student learning and student life and to some extent institutional effectiveness. These include a senior exit survey which measures satisfaction; a standardized external exam to measure student learning in general education; and department-based assessment. Various ad-hoc assessment projects arise during the academic year. All of these can be expanded and intensified, with assessment of institutional effectiveness being the farthest behind. We now look at each of these approaches.

#### Senior Exit Survey

The Senior Exit Survey, administered to seniors when they register with 90 credits, uses closed- and open-ended questions to cover many aspects of student life; it also offers students the opportunity to speak with a staff or faculty member face to face (Appendix 94). The Survey has consistently indicated high levels of satisfaction, particularly with faculty. But students complain about food, parking and tuition, not unusual on a college campus. The Survey has led to new activities by several departments. Based on survey results, the Library investigated the adequacy of reference materials in specific subject areas and trialed an expansion of its hours of operation. Admissions holds information sessions so students can become more aware of our own graduate programs. Campus Services works continually with students and the caterer to try to alleviate food dissatisfaction. The Survey is modified and updated slightly each year, reflecting changes on the campus as well as the analysis of the data. Appendix 95 provides summary results.

Currently, the Steering Committee is examining new options for the Survey: modifying it to concentrate on certain areas of interest for particular years; introducing a sophomore or junior survey to assess student satisfaction so changes can be made while those students are still present on campus; or maintaining the Survey as it. Recognizing that our survey does not measure student engagement, we are investigating the use of NSSE or the Profile of the American Student. (Appendix 96 contains reports presented to the Campus Outcomes Assessment Committee discussing the surveys.)

#### **External Standardized Examination to Measure General Education**

Our second outcomes assessment process is the administration to freshmen and seniors of a standardized test to measure learning in general education. Almost all freshmen take the exam, but we have been able to convince only a small percentage of seniors to do so. We used Academic Profile until the Educational Testing Service (ETS) stopped production; we now use their Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP). The administration of Academic Profile and then of MAPP required Faculty approval, reflecting faculty leadership in outcomes assessment policy. The MAPP results (Appendix 97) and the ETS interpretation of the scores are reported to the full-campus outcomes assessment committee; at meetings with individual schools and departments; and at the Campus Faculty meeting. One aim is for faculty see how the results compare with what happens in their courses. Faculty can then make teaching and student learning adjustments in the classroom as they think necessary.

Our students do not perform well on the exam and the Steering Committee is looking at possible explanations. One possibility is that since students bear no consequence for the results, students may not put in as much effort as they do for exams that affect their grades. One alternative approach is not to give the exam to all freshman and as many seniors as possible but to identify a small group of first-year students. These students would be followed from freshman to senior year and impressed with the importance of taking the exam seriously. The Steering Committee is working with Institutional Research to be sure that the sample is random and takes into account our retention rate. The Steering Committee reported this new approach to both the Campus Outcomes Assessment Committee and to the Campus Faculty with implementation scheduled for Fall 2008. (A supplementary report is in Appendix 98).

#### **Department-based Assessment of Student Learning**

Our third process is department-based outcomes assessment of student learning in the major and, for those departments offering courses in the Core, assessment of general education. Academic, co-curricular and support service departments are all required to submit annual reports to the Outcomes Assessment Steering Committee at the end of the academic year. This approach is the heart of outcomes assessment as it is aimed at direct measures of student learning while also recognizing the importance of co- and extra-curricula learning and guidance to a well-rounded education. The reports should include specific goals and actual outcomes and data of their measures. Once reports are reviewed by the chair of the outcomes assessment committee, written comments are provided to the chairs and deans. The department work and comments are usually discussed at workshops held within departments or schools the next academic year. An example of a workshop presentation which incorporates department work and comments is found in <u>Appendix 99</u>. Departments combine their own results with the feedback to make changes to improve student learning, thus closing the loop.

This process, in place since 1999, has evolved and accelerated in the last two years in its acceptance and application. Since the structure of the reports is less important than the content, departments have a choice between a locally-created form and their own narrative. They may use the locally-created form which delineates how mission drives goals and in turn outcomes and outcomes measures leading to results and feedback. Those departments who do not like the form have the option of submitting a narrative. That flexibility combined with workshops and

discussions has contributed to more cogent annual reports (See <u>Appendix 100</u> for some examples of closing the loop.).

All schools and colleges and support areas have created mission statements. Some have school-wide goals and have included outcomes measures with those goals. Most departments have created specific learning goals. The mission statements and goals are all consistent with the Campus mission statement and goals. Many departments have developed outcomes measures. A few, but growing number, have reached the stage of analyzing the data as a department and making changes in curriculum. The 2004 Strategic Plan, begun at the University level, has been gaining momentum on campus. Taking a college or school approach, deans have guided faculty in the development of unit-based strategic plans. The intention ultimately is to intertwine strategic planning and outcomes assessment. As outcomes assessment continues to mature, the interconnections with strategic planning should become more fluid. One example involves the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Strategic Planning Committee working with the College Outcomes Assessment Committee as it analyzes the Core.

#### **Committee Structure and Campus Collaboration**

A contributor to better understanding of outcomes assessment and its value has been the semester meetings of the Campus-wide Outcomes Assessment Committee. Those meetings include discussion of the Senior Exit Survey, the results of which are expected to be taken back to their respective departments for consideration of change; analysis of MAPP; and best practices. Invited faculty and staff present their use of outcomes assessment. The audience can, and then does, apply pertinent aspects to their own departments. Presentations of best practices are found in <u>Appendices 101</u> and <u>102</u>.

#### **Challenges across Campus**

As outcomes assessment proceeds, challenges are being overcome. These include faculty, staff, and administrators understanding terminology and the whole process; being motivated to do this work; acquiring data; and recognizing the importance of outcomes assessment to our institution and thus to our students. The workshops have helped faculty and support staff in learning the terminology and applying the principles of outcomes assessment (Appendix 99 contains examples of workshop presentations). In a few cases, the workshops, perhaps surprisingly, have also improved motivation as people see that outcomes assessment is useful to improving student learning, and that many have been doing such work, but in a different vein over the years. That is not to say that there has been a chant of "We want outcomes assessment" heard over campus, but the work has been more substantial as documented by the annual reports (See Appendix 100 for examples of resulting changes).

#### **Specific Challenges Faced by Departments**

Some departments involved in longitudinal studies from freshman to seniors have not had enough years for data collection. Yet, departments, including History and Media Arts, as shown in Appendix 100, are conducting formative assessment along the way.

Accreditation requirements had made many professional programs more familiar with outcomes assessment. However, in the last few years, these accrediting agencies are shifting away from program assessment to assessment of outcomes of student learning. The faculty and

staff of the professional schools, after recognizing this change in emphasis, are making the necessary adaptations.

#### **Goals for the Next Few Years:**

The Campus will be concentrating outcomes assessment efforts in three main areas:

- 1. Core Curriculum
- 2. Writing Across the Curriculum
- 3. Freshman Experience

Current efforts for the Core and WAC are found in the section discussing goals; freshman experience is presented below.

#### Freshman Experience

The C.W. Post Campus has started to use a data-driven process to examine and develop student learning goals for the freshman year. Recognizing that our retention of students could stand improvement, the university director for institutional research looked at statistics of freshmen. He identified patterns of such factors as SAT scores, classes taken in the freshman year, and identifiable programs (Appendix 60).

These statistics revealed that most freshmen take a few common courses; most satisfy Core requirements. Under the guidance of the C.W. Post Outcomes Assessment Steering Committee, several departments agreed to participate in analyzing student learning in these courses. Introductory English, Economics, Political Science, and Mathematics and the one-credit freshman seminar, College 101, were examined by their departments. This represents a good cross-section of a college curriculum, Humanities, Social Sciences, Mathematics, and freshman orientation.

The aim was to start to improve student learning by aligning goals of these first-year courses with this newly created first-year experience program goals. Since no first-year program goals existed, the process followed was inductive in nature, using the specific to make generalizations. The first step was for each department to formulate student learning goals for the participating course and then to create department goals. This process would involve interaction in analyzing course goals and department goals; as the process is evolving, one is feeding the other. Data from Institutional Research, including grade distribution, is being used in the analysis and development of goals as discussed below.(Appendix 103).

#### **Academic department processes and implementation of results:**

Each department decided to assess its courses differently for several reasons:

1) Departments are at different stages of the outcomes assessment process; 2) Disciplines evaluate student learning as appropriate to the subject matter; 3) Chairs were concerned about protecting student and faculty privacy; and 4) Grading processes vary.

The English Composition program developed a rubric which was evolved from previously-used rubrics, but made especially for this project. Mathematics similarly developed

rubrics for two questions each for Mth 3, and Mth 7, Calculus 1. Using randomly chosen papers (English) and tests (Mathematics), both departments used outside graders to use the rubric to analyze student work. It is interesting to note that English and Mathematics, often considered extremely different disciplines in terms of student learning ability, both chose and have found worthwhile a similar assessment process (Appendices 104 and 105).

The English Department examined a random sample of 76 papers drawn from papers submitted for a given assignment in freshman composition classes. The selected papers were graded by a team, using a detailed rubric that scored papers on a nine-point scale for content, organization, sentence structure and diction, and grammar and mechanics. While the results generally indicate that C.W. Post freshmen possess the necessary skills to write effectively, the results also seem to indicate that more class time should be devoted to grammar and sentence structure: while more than a third of papers received the highest scores (3.5 or 4) for content and organization, only seven percent received the highest scores for sentence structure and diction, and only three percent received the highest scores for grammar and mechanics.

Political Science decided to emphasize the concept of power and its presentation in Pol 1. A rubric measuring student comprehension was developed and applied to two different exam formats, multiple choice and essay. The department is using these results in its implementation of assessment of this core course in Fall 2008. It is discussing its assessment process with Sociology/Anthropology, thus showing the value of faculty collaboration, both within and between disciplines.

The Economics Department set out to assess students' grasp of the core concepts and basic analytical tools of economic theory, as well as students' ability to analyze and evaluate real-world problems and public policy. Twenty multiple choice questions dealing with basic economic concepts, market analysis, and a range of macroeconomic and microeconomic topics were constructed. These questions were included in the final examinations of most introductory sections of macroeconomics and microeconomics (Economics 11 and 12). The twenty questions put before each student were divided among four general areas considered essential to each course's curriculum. The data were collected and analyzed with respect to these four areas. The department is reviewing these scores with respect to the differences between students who receive a passing grade in the course and those who do not.

It should be noted that before the process of assessing the freshman experience started, Economics, as part of its outcomes assessment plan, had used curriculum mapping for all its major courses (See <u>Appendix 102</u>). In reviewing the annual reports, the Outcomes Assessment Committee identified several concepts that were also liberal arts concepts. These were presented at a workshop for College chairs (See <u>Appendix 99</u>).

The Mathematics Department looked at students' ability to complete four key problems included in the final examinations for Mth 3 and Mth 7. Each of these was an extended problem in either analytic geometry or elementary calculus. A random selection of student's final exam papers was submitted to a team of graders, who were provided with a scoring rubric. The average grades for three of the four problems ran between 8.0 and 8.6 on a ten-point scale. The mean grade for the remaining problem, a multi-part problem requiring students to specify and

graph a line having given properties, was 6.8. There is some concern about this low mean score, and the department intends to repeat this same grading exercise next year. The department is also requiring students in its calculus courses to achieve a grade of at least C- before proceeding to the next course in the sequence. Mathematics is considering different approaches to help students learn those concepts better, including more instruction time.

#### **College 101: Freshman Orientation**

College 101, freshman orientation, used a survey measuring self-reporting of student adjustment to college life. The data from the survey are being analyzed. Equal, or, perhaps, more important than the analysis of student impression of the curriculum is a renewed awareness of this course. Originally taught by faculty, over the years, staff and administrators have done the bulk of the teaching. Because of campus awareness of assessment, in general, and of this course in particular, as well as concerns about retention, a few faculty members are offering to teach the course in the fall. Their feeling is that faculty need to increase their connection to freshmen and freshmen will benefit from a semi-formal orientation course with faculty. Another result of the assessment of College 101 is the consideration of having freshmen read a common book during their first semester. To try to insure that the decision and process are made thoughtfully and carefully, a joint committee of Student Affairs and Faculty are aiming for Fall 2009.

#### **Challenges or opportunities:**

One challenge faced by all the academic departments is that the courses are open to all students. At least one department, Political Science, is considering designating freshman only sections.

The Program for Academic Success, PAS (our program for first-year students who do not meet admissions standards), limits student total credit hours, providing four contact hours for three-credit courses. These students must deal with the ordinary adjustments to college life as well as their own particular academic and social challenges. The participating departments are using the new freshman experience to enhance learning, by using the extra contact hour for interdisciplinary learning. Because of programming arrangements, classes in two disciplines could meet at the same time. Thus, students in two subjects, such as geography and philosophy, would meet as a group and learn about the interconnections of their disciplines. In Fall 2008, the classes would meet at most a few times during the semester, on an experimental basis.

#### **Unforeseen collaborations**

The efforts of the project described above are evolving into a more formalized Freshmen Experience at the C.W. Post Campus. Concurrently, it has expanded beyond, including assessment of the Core and WAC. It has intensified the process of outcomes assessment in particular departments at the course and program level and has led to interdepartmental cooperation. These intertwined processes should help the faculty develop measurable goals for learning in the freshman year.

#### **Regional Campuses Assessment Report**

Long Island University has four Regional Campuses: Brentwood Campus, Long Island University at Riverhead, Rockland Graduate Campus and Westchester Graduate Campus. Each has its own unique culture and programmatic identity that is in part, influenced by its affiliation and articulation with one or both of the Residential Campuses.

The academic "locus of control" drives the extent to which a Regional Campus is responsible for assessment of academic student learning. The Westchester and Long Island University at Riverhead Campuses have full responsibility for assessment of academic student learning in the teacher education programs. As such, comprehensive self-study reports for the teacher education programs at these two campuses were submitted to TEAC that address assessment and evaluation of student learning outcomes; both have attained successful accreditation. All of the teacher education programs offered at the Regional Campuses are fully accredited by TEAC. Furthermore, all of the Regional Campuses engage in ongoing assessment of the academic environment and resources for their respective student population, e.g., facilities, library holdings, the integration of technology into academic programs, the physical plant, and student satisfaction with the educational experience. (Appendices 106 to 109 describe in greater detail assessment processes at each Regional Campus.)

## **University Library Assessment Report**

Major University Library accomplishments are described in detail in <u>Appendix 41</u>. The University Library has adopted the Information Literacy Standards of the Association of College and Research Libraries as a guideline for their assessment and evaluation of information literacy. The Brooklyn librarians are working closely with the WAC program to integrate research skills with discipline writing. All undergraduate students at the C.W. Post and Brentwood Campuses must demonstrate basic competency in library research with successful completion of the Library Competency Exam or successful completion of the Library Competency Workshop. The C.W. Post librarians collaborated with the English Department to develop a program that requires at-risk students to participate in a minimum of two library instruction sessions as part of Reading, Writing and Interpretation (SST) courses.

At the University level, a LibQual Survey was administered during the Spring 2007 semester; further data will be collected. Assessment committee structures are in place at the Brooklyn and C.W. Post Campuses. Individualized assessment tools have been designed for specialized classes at the Brooklyn Campus. Consistent and standardized reporting of outcomes assessment activities is occurring at the C.W. Post Campus. An Outcomes Assessment Form was created and an assessment cycle was created. Assessment activities are also taking place at the Regional Campuses, e.g., basic assessment measures for collecting data on number of reference questions, number of instruction classes and number of patrons were initiated at the Brentwood Campus. There are plans to implement a faculty/student user survey Spring 2010.

## Summary

#### **Accomplishments**

## Faculty Support and Development

The University community has experienced a synergistic effect from the coordinated work of Academic Affairs and Institutional Research in assessment of student learning. The two offices have partnered in an effort to provide the campuses with the requisite data, analyses and support needed to sustain assessment. The newly appointed University Director of Assessment is consulting with faculty and administrators across the University on assessment tools, best practices and linking outcomes to program improvement. In its sixth year, under the leadership of Academic Affairs, the University-wide Teaching and Learning Initiative (TLI) and the annual Teaching with Technology Institute (TTI) provide ongoing faculty development in pedagogical approaches that enhance student learning in the classroom.

#### Assessment Management Tools and Instruments

In 2006-2007, the University purchased StudentVoice, a comprehensive assessment system that includes consultation, assessment resources, project design and data collection, and reporting technologies. StudentVoice is an assessment tool of Student Services and co-curricular activities; it provides a range of methods utilizing advanced mobile and web technologies. The Office of Academic Affairs also purchased WEAVEonline, an online assessment management system in December 2007. Under the guidance of the University Director of Assessment, WEAVEonline will be implemented on a pilot basis for interested academic programs across the University in Fall 2008. Subsequent to pilot implementation, it is expected that the University will gain insight into the role of the software in the development of models for assessment data entry and management.

For many years, student evaluation of teaching was managed by the student government associations (SGA) at the two residential campuses. In 2002, the Office of Academic Affairs assumed responsibility for University-wide administration of the student evaluation system after both SGA's elected to discontinue participation in the process. At that time, the campuses employed two different course evaluation instruments, as mandated by their respective collective bargaining agreements. Both instruments were created locally; faculty raised concerns about the validity and reliability of the instruments, and the resulting course evaluation data and reports. Furthermore, the student course evaluation process was administered unevenly across departments and campuses during the Fall semester only, and tracking mechanisms monitoring departmental and campus return rates were absent.

Given the serious concerns about the quality of the student course evaluation system, the Vice President for Academic Affairs initiated a series of faculty discussions that culminated in the adoption of a new student course evaluation system in Fall 2006, the University of Washington Instructional Assessment System (IAS). The IAS was implemented in Spring 2007 at all campuses, in both Fall and Spring semesters. Having collected data for just two semesters, it is too early to assess the overall impact of the new student course evaluation system. Campus response rates are favorable (ranging from seventy-six to ninety-eight percent) compared to prior years, and are increasing as the University gains more experience with the system. Faculty and administration have responded favorably to the use of a demonstrably valid and reliable

instrument and the extensive data generated in summary reports that can be used for developmental and evaluative purposes.

#### Instructional Technology, Blended and Online Learning

Long Island University is cognizant of changing demographics in higher education, enrollments trends, affordability of college tuition and market competition. As a result, the institution has devoted a great deal of time during the past several years to the role of web-mediated instruction in the education of our students, whether online, blended or simply web-enhanced instruction. An extensive document on teaching with technology and blended learning, prepared by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, has been widely circulated to faculty and administration (Appendix 27). In Fall 2007, the Vice President for Academic Affairs created a University-wide Web-Mediated Instruction Task Force (WMTF) comprised of faculty and administrators from across the University. The WMTF prepared a report on policies and best practices for offering blended courses at the graduate level at Long Island University (Appendix 110). In the upcoming year, the WMTF will look at tools and best practices for assessment of blended learning.

As the University considers very carefully the parameters of blended learning at our institution, the Office of Academic Affairs adopted a "policy of experimentation" that provides an opportunity on a pilot basis for faculty to experiment with developing new blended courses. One such pilot is the Faculty Learning Community (FLC) on Blended Learning, a University-wide faculty development opportunity for approximately 10 interested faculty (Appendix 111). Interested faulty have already submitted proposals that are currently under review by the WMTF. Recruited faculty will participate in a two-day professional development workshop in June 2008 designed to prepare the selected faculty to offer a blended course in the Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 semesters. The University Director of Assessment is working with a WMTF subcommittee to develop appropriate assessment methods and instruments for evaluation of learning in these courses.

#### Recommendations

Looking forward to our decennial re-accreditation, Long Island University will continue to seek, and find, better ways to reach our common goal of helping all students reach their full potential. Two recommendations are made regarding methodologies used in assessment of student learning. First, summative assessment of general education and key literacies must be further developed. Second, it is critical that formative assessment of learning and success in the freshman year, as it relates to persistence and retention, must be further developed and assessed, with results used to inform curricular revisions.

Long Island University must continue to make more transparent to ourselves and our various constituencies, what our aims are, how we seek to achieve them, and the extent to which we succeed. To do so, the University administration will enhance, in breadth and depth, the infrastructure needed to support ongoing assessment of the quality of student learning. Institutional Research, the Office of Academic Affairs, including the University Director of Assessment, will continue to work collaboratively with all major divisions, schools and programs to refine and measure student learning outcomes linked to program and University mission and goals. The University will continue to explore and provide budgetary support and faculty

development for methods of gathering evidence of student learning, including MAPP, NSSE, StudentVoice, WEAVEonline and electronic portfolios. Ongoing faculty development in assessment of student learning and development of coherent, effective strategies for educational improvement will continue to be provided through workshops and conferences offered by campus-based outcomes assessment committees, the Director of Assessment and the University-wide TLI.

A number of steps will be taken with respect to recommendations dealing with university-wide assessment and communication. A five-year plan is being formulated by the University Director of Assessment and the campus co-chairs beginning with development of a written assessment plan based on already-established linkages across the various levels of assessment efforts. To explore these linkages, the Director will undertake a University-wide assessment inventory. Consistent with existing campus-based assessment efforts, the Director will reinforce a faculty-driven, mission-based approach to assessment. The process of using workshops and one-on-one consultations will be expanded to further develop a core of informed, skilled campus-based assessment leaders. The Director will work with University and campus-based leaders to enhance the culture of open communication regarding assessment efforts, results and outcomes in response to changes. New avenues for structured, routine reporting of assessment progress will be instituted through a University assessment newsletter, reporting to outcomes assessment committees, periodic updates at Deans' meetings, and an annual report to University Officers.

Long Island University is committed to gathering evidence about educational and institutional effectiveness, and most important, about the ability of our graduates to succeed in a complex, diverse and rapidly changing world. It is the collective responsibility of the University community to engage in the process of continuous improvement in order to achieve its stated mission of access and excellence, and its strategic agenda priority of creating a student-centered educational environment.

## **Chapter 5 - Linked Institutional Planning and Budgeting**

## Introduction

As described in Chapter 1 of this document, Long Island University has undertaken a comprehensive program of integrated strategic planning known as the *Strategic Agenda* (see Appendix 3). The planning process, now in its third year, has engaged the entire University community in a discussion about key institutional priorities and the University's future. This effort has been led by a full-time Vice President for Planning, in partnership with the other University Officers, faculty members, staff, students, alumni, and trustees.

The University's *Strategic Agenda* is linked to budgeting/resource allocation in myriad, layered ways. Indeed, a major goal of the *Strategic Agenda* is to improve the University's financial position and to enhance its ability to fulfill its student-centered teaching mission. This goal is expressed in the *Agenda's* third priority: "Financial Stability, Entrepreneurial Growth, and Management of Risks." The key questions in this section of the *Strategic Agenda* address tuition pricing, fundraising, revenue growth, expenditure management, budget processes, regional campus income, and investments in the physical plant.

#### **Key Investments**

From the beginning, the University Officers understood that the planning process would require substantial institutional investments. The most notable example is the implementation of the PeopleSoft/Oracle Enterprise Resource Planning System. Over time, the \$25 million investment in a state-of-the art administrative operating system will allow the University to streamline administrative operations, improve student transaction services (such as admissions, financial aid, bursar, and registration), and provide access to timely and accurate data required for managerial decision making, including budgeting, planning, marketing, and daily operations.

The University's strategic plan has also required major investments – one-time and ongoing – in consultants, new personnel, technologies, and the physical plant – in areas linked to the *Strategic Agenda's* priorities and key questions. To date, the University has made major investments in consulting, new personnel, technology, and physical plant, as summarized below:

#### Consulting

The University has engaged several nationally recognized external consultants in the past three years to support the *Strategic Agenda*. The consultants have brought expert knowledge in key areas, including survey research, market analysis, environmental scanning, program demand analysis, online learning, undergraduate retention, Web site design, tuition pricing and discounting, and the role of the university library in the digital age. The consultants have also provided an objective, data driven perspective on numerous priorities in the *Strategic Agenda*, as well as a deep understanding of higher education best practices. The use of consultants has accelerated the pace of institutional change, permitting the University to tackle simultaneously many areas of the *Strategic Agenda*, including the most complex and technical questions. Some consulting fees – such as alumni and prospect survey research conducted with market research firm Kane, Parsons and Associates, and retention studies completed with assistance from

Scannell & Kurz, Inc. – represent one-time expenditures. Other consulting fees, such as memberships in Eduventures Continuing Education and Online Learning research programs, represent annual, recurring commitments.

#### New Personnel

The impetus for creating (and funding) several new university offices, and senior-level personnel to staff them, has also emerged out of our planning processes and key priorities (see <a href="Appendix 112">Appendix 112</a>). For instance, augmenting and strengthening the University's Institutional Research Office has been central to the execution of the *Strategic Agenda*. In fall, 2006, the University hired a new Director of Institutional Research who brings three decades of institutional research experience in a multi-campus university system. The revitalized office now has three full-time staff, suitable space, appropriate computer hardware and software, and access to the University's legacy and ERP data systems. Increasingly, in addition to handling standard reporting, the office is providing the institutional data essential to inform institutional planning, decision making, policy formation, resource allocation, and analytical studies.

To address faculty development, student learning, and curricular development, the University's Office of Academic Affairs hired two faculty coordinators of instructional technology in 2006. The coordinators are responsible for developing a university-wide vision for successful technology integration as well as helping faculty to utilize technology to promote student achievement. As discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2, the University plans to hire an Associate Vice President for Instructional Technology and Dean of Virtual College who will be charged with providing leadership for University-wide management of instructional technology, including technology-enhanced instruction, teleconferencing, blended learning and online learning.

Recognizing the strategic importance of the University's Web site as a gateway for communication, the University has embarked on a major, multi-year project to upgrade significantly its Web site, including design, functionality, content management, and portals. To spearhead this major University-wide effort, the Office of University Relations has created a new position, Assistant Vice President for Web Communication. The new Assistant Vice President, who joined the University in 2007, is working closely with other staff in Marketing and Public Relations, campus working groups, and consultants from BigBad, a Boston-based web design firm the University has engaged to assist with the redesign project. The new Web site is expected to "go-live" in calendar year 2009.

The University recently hired a highly qualified Director of Outcomes Assessment to support institution-wide outcomes assessment at the Brooklyn and C.W. Post Campuses and to provide critical support in the development of an assessment culture across the University. Working with the Office of Academic Affairs, campus outcomes assessment committees, deans and chairs, the Director will design, plan and implement institution-wide assessment strategies to improve student learning and to inform institutional decision making, including budgeting.

## **Technology**

In addition to funding ERP, the University has invested in several other technologies that support the *Strategic Agenda*. In 2006, the University acquired a site license for StudentVoice,

an innovative technology tool facilitating the collection and analysis of data to guide meaningful decisions about student programs and services. This technology has significantly expanded our ability to conduct student outcomes assessment, and has been used extensively at the Brooklyn Campus. More recently, the University acquired a site license for WEAVEonline, a web-based assessment system that will enable us to manage assessment and quality improvement processes, and promote collaboration within and across academic and administrative units. Finally, the University is about to acquire a site license for a content management system that will enhance our ability to manage web content throughout our large, decentralized enterprise.

#### **Physical Plant**

Since the last site visit report, the University has completed numerous capital projects to further the goals of the *Strategic Agenda*. Projects include new athletic, wellness, and recreation facilities, new student residences, new state-of-the-art classrooms, and aesthetically pleasing outdoor spaces. Highlights of these major projects are described in Chapter 1 of this Periodic Review Report. In each case, the University budget has absorbed the costs of debt service, depreciation, and annual operating costs. In total, the University will invest nearly \$28 million in numerous life-safety, deferred maintenance, energy conservation, and academic facility improvements and upgrades through 2009. The University also completed, with assistance from Sightlines LLC, a major study of the University's physical assets – buildings, grounds, and infrastructure – in order to help us better manage and maintain our campus facilities and to link facilities operating strategy and financial capacity.

In each case, the investments in consulting, new personnel, technology, and the physical plant were linked directly to priorities and questions in the *Strategic Agenda*.

## **Resource Development and Systems**

Funding the *Strategic Agenda* is a major goal of the planning process. Like most strategic plans, Long Island University's strategic plan will require the identification of incremental funds to support key priorities, such as investments in academic programs, online learning, renovated or new facilities, student financial aid, and faculty development. This is a significant challenge for a relatively young university with a modest endowment, high tuition dependency, and a mission of Access and Excellence. The University Officers are pursuing a number of tactics to improve the University's financial position, and, equally important, to provide funding for essential priorities in the *Strategic Agenda*. Since the last Middle States site team visit in 2003, the University has appointed a new chief financial officer, who has sought to strengthen the linkages between institutional planning and budgeting in support of the University's mission of "Access and Excellence". To this end, he has emphasized the importance of revenue growth, expense reduction/cost containment, and sound financial systems and budget processes. Summaries of key strategies and tactics are described below:

#### **Revenue Growth**

## Growing the Endowment Fund

In October, 2006, the University sold its Southampton Campus to the State University of New York for \$35 million. The proceeds helped increase the market value of the University's endowment from \$46 million to \$91 million as of June 30, 2007. The annual spending generated

by this addition represents nearly \$2 million of incremental revenue to fund University initiatives.

#### Issuing Long Term Debt

The University has taken advantage of low tax-exempt interest rates to fund important capital projects. For instance, the University issued \$72 million of debt in 2006 which, among other things, refinanced \$17 million of then existing debt - generating net present value savings of \$2.3 million. The restructuring also provided approximately \$21 million which the University will use to fund its 3 to 1 matching requirement pursuant to New York State's inaugural capital matching program for independent colleges and universities.

## Funding for new or expanded academic programs

Since 2003, the University developed a rigorous planning process for estimating marginal revenues and expenses for new or expanded academic programs that are grounded in University strengths and student demand. Examples include a Master's Degree in Social Work (Brooklyn and C.W. Post) and in Homeland Security (Riverhead Regional Campus), a new regional campus in Riverhead, and expanded locations for Nursing (Brooklyn) to meet hospital and community demand. The University is also developing business plans for possible new master's degree programs in Public Health (Brooklyn), Teaching of English as a Second Language (Brooklyn), Global Studies (Global College), and Genetics Counseling (C.W. Post). A major project is underway to understand the potential for developing a new, University-wide Virtual College. Much of this work has been done in conjunction with Eduventures, a Boston-based consulting and market research firm serving the higher education community. Eduventures has developed rigorous models for assessing market size, student demand, and employer interest in contemplated academic programs. Examples of these studies are included in Appendices 11 and 17 through 23.

#### Strategic Use of Financial Aid

With assistance from enrollment consultants Scannell & Kurz, Inc., the University has conducted several major studies of the strategic use of price and financial aid to improve student retention, enhance access for low- and middle-income students, increase net tuition revenue, and efficiently build new transfer, undergraduate, and graduate enrollments on the C.W. Post and Brooklyn Campuses. Major studies include an analysis of undergraduate tuition pricing and discounting practices at Brooklyn and C.W. Post; an assessment of pricing and scholarship practices for the doctoral programs in clinical psychology at Brooklyn and C.W. Post; a study of undergraduate retention and persistence; and an assessment of pricing and discounting practices for the M.B.A. program at C.W. Post's College of Management. The studies are important in view of the University's student-centered mission of "Access and Excellence" and the magnitude of the University's investment in financial aid. In fiscal year 2007, the University allocated over \$57 million in aid to undergraduate and graduate students.

For each study, Scannell & Kurz conducted extensive on-site interviews with faculty, staff and students from the Brooklyn and C.W. Post Campuses and University Center, as well as extensive quantitative analysis and modeling. The consultants' reports, specific to each campus, provide a wealth of insights about campus enrollment and scholarship policies and practices, and a set of actionable recommendations which the University is beginning to implement. A

summary of the undergraduate tuition pricing and discounting practices report is included as Appendix 14.

#### Bridge Campaign

Having successfully completed the Campaign for Long Island University in 2006, resulting in nearly \$140 million raised, the University has embarked on a Bridge Campaign emphasizing key priorities in the *Strategic Agenda*, in particular, support for student scholarships. Under the leadership of the Vice President for University Relations, the University has made fundraising for scholarships a top priority in the Bridge Campaign. Since September 2003, the University has raised over \$5 million for endowed scholarships, bringing the total to over \$12 million. In total, the University raised \$52.6 million in this period. One of the other goals of the *Strategic Agenda* is to sustain important cultural and community outreach, and to work toward making these activities financially self-sustaining. Several bridge initiatives focus on this goal. The Bridge Campaign plan, with a matrix linking Campaign objectives and revenue generation to University strategic priorities, is included in the Appendix 113.

#### **Expense Reduction / Cost Containment**

## Southampton Campus

In recent years, the Southampton Campus generated increasingly larger deficits which reduced the University's ability to fund key initiatives at the other residential campuses and weakened the University financial position overall. The closure of Southampton mitigated the deficit and, in the long run, will give the University more flexibility to fund strategic initiatives.

#### Faculty Expenses and Productivity

The Office of Academic Affairs closely monitors financial expenditures and conducts ongoing workload analysis to control costs and maintain or improve faculty productivity. A major goal, following the closure of the Southampton Campus, is to reduce the number of faculty over a five-year period through attrition, buyouts, early retirements, and reassignment. Doing so should reduce faculty expenditures and allow the Academic Vice President to allocate new faculty appointments to support current programmatic initiatives and strategic priorities. The Office of Academic Affairs has also created a more rigorous process for reviewing new faculty appointments, as well as applications for tenure, promotion, and sabbaticals.

#### Fringe Benefits Costs

Employee fringe benefit costs are a major expense at most colleges and universities and Long Island University is no exception to this rule. About \$60 million of the University's \$350 million operating budget is allocated to fringe benefits. In recent years, the University has sought to contain these costs, while at the same time providing competitive benefits to attract and retain a skilled workforce and faculty. Since the last site team visit, the University has hired an Associate Vice President for Human Resources with expertise in the design of cost-effective fringe benefits plans. Reviews of the University's fringe benefits programs are underway.

#### Business Process Redesign

With most of the major modules of ERP now implemented, the University is looking at ways to use the system to increase productivity, improve efficiency, reduce costs, or generate revenue. The University has engaged consultants to determine areas where the institution can

net the greatest return on investment by aligning business processes and practices with the functionality of the new system, using best practices.

## Financial Systems and Budget Processes

The University successfully implemented the ERP Financial Module in 2005-2006. The module replaced the University's legacy mainframe system in place since the 1970s. The new system supports the accurate and timely reporting of financial data required for routine reporting, budgeting, variance analysis, internal auditing, risk management, and the annual financial statements. The implementation also provided an opportunity to review longstanding accounting policies and practices – such as the chart of accounts, financial statement presentation, and both annual and multi-year budget formation – in light of ERP system capabilities and the University's strategic priorities.

## **Strategic Planning within Academic Units**

As discussed in Chapter 1 of this Periodic Review Report, at the request of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, each academic dean prepared an Academic Year 2007/2008 Plan covering the following areas: program review; programmatic initiatives; fundraising/resource development; external partnerships; outcomes assessment; faculty workload management; marketing; and strategic planning. The preparation of the plans followed several discussions with the deans about the importance of academic planning, and a day-long retreat emphasizing the relationship between University-wide and School-based planning. Copies of the school-based plans are included in the <a href="Appendix 24">Appendix 24</a>. The Vice President for Planning continues to work with individual deans to ensure that School-based plans are congruent with the University's *Strategic Agenda*, and to provide support for specific projects, such enrollment studies, net tuition analysis, and marketing/program demand research.

## Summary

Since the last Middle States Evaluation Team visit, Long Island University has undertaken a comprehensive institutional planning process called the *Strategic Agenda*. The University is now in the third year of the *Strategic Agenda*, and substantial progress has been made in each of the five core priorities. Many new initiatives tied to the *Strategic Agenda* have been funded, including funds for ERP, consultants, new personnel, technology enhancements, and physical plant upgrades and additions. In order to provide funds for strategic initiatives and to improve the University's overall financial position, the University is pursuing multiple resource development strategies, including revenue enhancement, expense reduction, cost containment, and productivity improvement.

The University is seeking to build a culture of evidence to inform policy formation and decision making, including resource allocation. This effort has been facilitated by an expanded institutional research office and, where necessary, experienced outside consultants. A newly hired Director of Outcomes Assessment will further expand the University's ability to collect and analyze student outcomes data that will be used to inform program reviews and budgeting.

ERP has already improved our ability to extract and present financial information. The University's ability to link budgeting and planning will be enhanced significantly by the implementation of a business intelligence and performance management software solution. The timeline for the implementation of an end-to-end Enterprise Performance Management is currently under development. In the meantime, the University chief financial officer continues to refine budget policies and practices to support the University mission and strategic initiatives, as well as to take advantage of the functionality of the new system.

In the coming year, the University will be developing a comprehensive dashboard to measure and monitor its progress in key areas connected to the *Strategic Agenda*. This dashboard will cover key areas such as finances, enrollment, students, and staffing. This information will provide valuable measures for linking institutional planning and budgeting, and to demonstrate the effectiveness of our planning processes overall.

## Appendices

1	Report of Middle States Evaluation Team (April 2003)
2	Recommendations Extracted from 2003 Evaluation Team Report
3	Strategic Agenda
4	Strategic Planning Organization Chart
5	Communication Plan for Strategic Planning
6	Timelines for University's Strategic Agenda
7	Excerpt from Spring 2006 Long Island University Magazine
8	Board of Trustees Planning Committee - Meeting Agendas
9	Board of Trustees Planning Committee - Meeting Minutes
10	Progress Reports Submitted to Planning Committee
11	Report: Riverhead Site Study
12	Riverhead Site: Summary of Success Factors and Financial Projections
13	Report: Undergraduate Prospect Market Research
14	Report: Undergraduate Strategic Pricing and Financial Aid Review
15	Report: Undergraduate Retention - C.W. Post Campus
16	Report: Return on Physical Assets
17	Report: Demand for a Clinical Nurse Leader Master's Degree - Brooklyn Campus
18	Report: Information Professionals - Employment Trends - C.W. Post Campus
19	Report: Demand for a Bachelor's Degree in Criminal Justice - Brooklyn Campus
20	Report: Demand for a B.S. in Pharmacy/Pharmaceutics-
21	College of Pharmacy Report: Demand for a Bachelor's Degree in Forensic Science- Brooklyn Campus
22	Report: The Market for Online Degrees in Liberal Arts
23	Report: Demand for a Master's Degree in Public Health - Brooklyn Campus
24	Strategic Planning Documents of the University's Academic Units
25	University Bylaws (Adopted November 2006)
26	Report: Space Utilization at the C.W. Post Campus
27	"New Modes of Learning: Technology and Teaching at Long Island University for the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century"
28	Report: Re-Envisioning Long Island University Libraries
29	Academic Strategic Planning

30	Supplemental Response to Middle States Recommendation about Student Communication - Brooklyn Campus
31	Supplemental Response to Middle States Recommendation about Student Communication - C.W. Post Campus
32	Supplemental Response to Middle States Recommendation about Condition of Academic Facilities - Brooklyn Campus
33	Supplemental Response to Middle States Recommendation about Condition of Academic Facilities - C.W. Post Campus
34	Supplemental Response to Middle States Recommendation about Support for Students at Risk - C.W. Post Campus
35	Supplemental Response to Middle States Recommendation about  Cross-Campus Faculty Collaboration
36	<u>University Faculty Senate Constitution</u>
36.1	Memorandum of Understanding
37	Correspondence Between Board of Trustees and Faculty Representatives
38	Faculty Appointment Authorization Form
39	Adjunct Faculty Survey
40	Preliminary Findings from Adjunct Faculty Survey
41	Supplemental Response to Middle States Recommendation about Library Resources
42	Monitoring Report on Southampton Campus (December 2004)
43	Monitoring Report on Southampton Campus (February 2005)
44	Final Progress Report on Southampton Campus (May 2006)
45	Report: Web Site Needs Assessment
46	Web Site Redesign Proposal
47	Web Site Redesign - Draft Page Designs
48	Web Site Redesign - Timeline
49	Job Description: Associate Vice President for Instructional Technology / Dean of Virtual College
50	Global College Five-year Budget Plan
51	Mission Statement - C.W. Post Campus
52	Goals and Objectives - C.W. Post Campus
53	C.W. Post Academic Changes
54	Activities Driven by Campus Mission, Goals & Objectives
55	Audited Financial Statements - August 31, 2006
56	Audited Financial Statements - August 31, 2007

57	IPEDS Finance Surveys (2006-07 and 2007-08)
58	Report: 5-year Enrollment
59	Facts in Brief: University Profile 07-08
60	Baseline Statistics for Freshman Programs
61	Freshman Year Selected Courses
62	
_	Student Life Integration Committee  Action Plans & Improvement Efforts for Core Cyrricalum
63 64	Action Plans & Improvement Efforts for Core Curriculum  Professional Program Accorditation Status
	Professional Program Accreditation Status  Outcomes Assessment Matrix
65	Outcomes Assessment Matrix  Core Consideration Cools
66	Core Curriculum Goals  Core Consideration Assessment Matrix
67	Core Curriculum Assessment Matrix
68	Core Courses Descriptions
69 <b>5</b> 0	English Placement Exam Rubric
70 	English Composition Grading Rubric
71	University of Washington Survey Form
72	Core Seminar Assessment
73	NSSE 2007 Benchmark Report
74	Writing & Analytical Goals in Core Curriculum
75	Computer Literacy Exam Results
76	Mathematics Assessment Preliminary Results
77	<u>Library Outcomes Assessment</u>
78	Assessment of Assessment Process and Results
79	Assessment Measures & Results, Program Level
80	Action Plans & Improvement Efforts, Program Level
81	Admissions Research
82	Assessment Measures & Results, Admissions
83	Action Plans & Improvement Efforts, Admissions
84	Best Practices Research
85	Retention Studies
86	Review of Professional & Licensed Academic Programs
87	Annual Assessment for Professional Schools
88	Action Plans & Improvement Efforts, Professional Schools
89	Area Specific Assessment Workshop, Health Professions
90	Professional Accreditations

91	Student & Alumni Satisfaction Research
92	Performance Indicators, Benchmarks & Peer Comparisons
93	Enrollment Profile and Analysis
94	Senior Exit Survey
95	Senior Exit Survey Summary Results
96	Profile of American Student
97	MAPP Results
98	Supplementary MAPP Implementation Report
99	Workshop Presentation of Dept Work
100	Closing the Loop
101	Best Practices: Missions, Goals, Objectives
102	Best Practices: Outcomes Assessment
103	Grade Distribution
104	English Assessment
105	Mathematics Assessment
106	Brentwood Campus Assessment Report
107	Riverhead Campus Assessment Report
108	Rockland Campus Assessment Report
109	Westchester Campus Assessment Report
110	WMTF Blended & Online Learning Policies & Best Practices
111	Proposal for Faculty Learning Community
112	Strategic Agenda Staff
113	Bridge Campaign Matrix