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Executive Summary

The Budget & Staff Allocation Committee (BSAC) of the College Senate was asked to conduct an Administrative Array review as a complement to the Academic Array review of 2013-14. The outcomes in this report are based on several goals: the need for assessment at all levels of the institution; the movement toward all-college learning outcomes and the concomitant need for more collaborative administrative structures; and the adoption of all-funds budgeting. The recommendations in this report are also based on an assessment of Buffalo State’s last administrative re-organization in 2004, the outcome of which was the creation of one additional school (SOE) and two new academic administrative units (Graduate School and University College). An assessment of the 2004 re-organization suggests its associated goals were not met. Based on this assessment and the need to create more collaborative organizational structures, we recommend the following actions:

1. Creation of a two-school academic structure
2. Merge the Graduate Office administrative unit with Enrollment Management, and elevate EM to a cabinet-level position
3. Creation of a unit focused on Academic Rigor & Support in place of University College
4. Move housing and food services to Finance & Management to facilitate all-funds budgeting
5. Re-focusing Student Affairs toward student campus life, and combining the VP and Dean of Students into a single AVP & Dean of Students position reporting to the Provost.

Questions for College Senators:

1. Does Buffalo State need to re-organize its current administrative structures?
2. If yes to 1, then which changes in the proposed re-organization do you think make sense and which ones do not?
3. Over the past 20 years FT staff have increased by 50% while the number of FT faculty has remained relatively constant; should Buffalo State reallocate resources to support more FT faculty?
4. Should there be a formal assessment policy for campus administrators?

---

1 BSAC believes Buffalo State needs transformative change in order to become more competitive. There were discussions about whether we should be bold or conservative in our recommendations, and we opted to err on the bold side. Our intent is not to create dissension, rather it is to create discussion and debate about the future direction of the institution.
I. Introduction

Higher education is in the midst of a transformative period that is causing a “shake out” within the industry. Historically, threats have been perceived as temporary, typically caused by downturns in the economy which reduced public support over a relatively short period of time. The perfect storm of the Great Recession, permanently reducing State support, combined with the threat of cheaper online technologies suggests “this time is different.” The number of schools closed or merged has increased from 5 per year prior to 2008 to 10 per year post, leading one Harvard Business School professor to predict that half of the 4,000 U.S. colleges and universities will close within the next 15 years.2

While the two primary factors driving change are the reduction in state support and the growth/acceptance of online degrees, there are additional threats including the impact of demographic changes on enrollments, students questioning the usefulness of a college degree, and encroachment on the curriculum from external mandates. In this Darwinian era, institutions will either evolve or die.

Unlike the private sector, higher education—especially public higher education—is slow to adapt to change. Bureaucratic structures have been established over a long, relatively tranquil period of growth, and these structures have created a level of inertia that makes change difficult. However, if institutions fail to react, they will eventually be forced to react.

While public institutions can currently out-compete private institutions on cost, the gap is closing. States and localities are under increasing pressure to reduce spending (especially in the Northeast), and flat state support has been offset by increases in tuition and fees. In addition, private institutions are offering competitive discounts to stem the tide of declining enrollments. At all levels, institutions are engaging in behavior characterized by the tragedy of the commons, where self-interest leads to making all worse off. In WNY, for example, as UB accepts more students from lower profile categories, all other WNY institutions are forced to do the same in order to maintain enrollment levels. In the long run, quality declines at all institutions.

If public institutions are going to survive this disruptive era, then costs will need to be reined in. Several studies have tried to estimate the underlying drivers of rising costs in higher education. Martin and Hill (2014) analyze rising costs from 1987 to 2011.3 Based on the literature, they suggest two theories of cost drivers in higher education: the Baumol effect, which states that

---

costs in service-oriented industries with low productivity growth are driven by broader wage gains in the macro economy, as service workers demand higher wages to keep pace with national wage gains; the Bowen effect which states “universities raise all the money they can and then spend it on an unlimited list of projects that seemingly enhance ‘quality’.” (p. 2)

Martin and Hill break their sample into two periods, the first from 1987-2005 is characterized as having “loose revenue constraints,” the boom period for higher education; and the second, from 2008-2011, is characterized as a period of tight revenue constraints, as the recession significantly, and most likely permanently, reduced state support. Focusing on their results for public institutions, they find:

- From 1987 to 2011, FT faculty decreased from 64% to 53%.
- From 1987 to 2011, the number of full time nonacademic professional staff per tenure track faculty member doubled at public universities.
- At public universities the estimates for total change in cost per student are $12,126 from 1987 to 2005 (loose period) and $1,644 from 2008 to 2011 (tight period).
- The Baumol effect (wage increases) was responsible for 23% of the cost increases during the loose period and 32% during the tight period.
- The Bowen effect (bureaucratic creep) was responsible for 51% of increased costs during the loose period and 29% of costs during the tight period.

At Buffalo State the trends are not dissimilar. Relative to SUNY peers, Buffalo State is one of three institutions with an instructional expense ratio currently below 50% (See Table 1.1).

Table 1.1: Instruction Expense as a Percent of Core Expenses 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Instruction expenses as a percent of total core expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUNY College at Brockport</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY College at Geneseo</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Fredonia</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY College at Plattsburgh</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY College at Potsdam</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY College at Oswego</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY College at Cortland</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY College at Old Westbury</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buffalo State SUNY</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Oneonta</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Purchase College</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPEDs
Employment trends at Buffalo State have followed the national trend. Figure 1.1 provides trends in personnel for the period 1995-96 to 2013-14. The most notable change is a 50% increase in FT professionals, while FT faculty have remained roughly constant.

**Figure 1.1: Personnel Trends @ Buffalo State**

![Graph showing personnel trends from 1995-96 to 2013-14.](image)

**NOTE:** The sudden change in FT Professionals in 2003-04 is due to the reclassification of ~40 Professionals as Administrators (for reporting purposes) from that year forward.

Given the reclassification that occurred in 2003-04, we re-display the data in Figure 1.1 by changing the base year to 2003-04 (this is also consistent with our assessment of Buffalo State’s last administrative re-organization). The results are shown in Figure 1.2, and we have also included the trend in “administrators” or MCs. Since 2003-04, FT professionals have increased by 28% (equivalent to an increase of 75 FT staff), MCs have increased by 15%, and FT faculty have increased by 8%. Interestingly, as enrollments have declined since 2010, the trend in FT professionals and administrators has continued to rise.
**Figure 1.2: Personnel Trends from 2003-04**

![FT Employee and Student Trends, since 2003-2004](image)

NOTES: 1) There is a discontinuity in the data before 2003, partly due to the reclassification of some Professionals as Administrators, and partly because different categories were used for Secretary and Maintenance employees.  
2) The data is from Dec. payrolls, before UUP retirements were processed.

**Figure 1.3 Trends in Employment 1995-96 to 2013-14**

![Faculty, Total Employees, and Student FTE trends over 19 Years](image)

Figure 1.3 shows long term trends in the raw data for several employment measures over the past 17 years. Student FTE has increased by 4.8%, FT faculty by 1.2%, and FT employees by
28.4% over the 17-year period. While not adjusted for FTE, PT faculty now outnumber FT faculty.

Table 1.2 shows changes in total personnel by vice presidential area from fall 2003 to fall 2013. We chose this period of analysis because it covers a ten-year period since the last administrative re-organization. On a percent basis, the largest increase occurred within Institutional Advancement, a 44% increase in FT staff. Focusing on changes within each VP area (numbers are not shown), the largest increase in FT personnel within Student Affairs occurred in the sub-category Residence Life, which experienced an increase of 14.5 FT positions. In Finance & Management, the largest increase occurred in the sub-category custodial services which increased by 23 FT positions. While ISAS did not experience any measurable increase over this period, the major changes in technology support occurred during the five-year period prior to 2003. In 1998 there were 27 FT lines in Computing Services compared to the current 60 FT positions. Within Academic Affairs, most of the increase in personnel was associated with the 2004 re-organization which created an additional school (SOE) and two new administrative units, University College and Graduate Studies: 6 of the 7 positions in AA were associated with creation of SOE, and within UC, the majority of the positions created (10 of 12) were associated with administration of UC. While not shown in Table 1.2, the number of MC positions increased by 15 from over the same period.

Table 1.2 Personnel Changes by VP Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP Area</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Advance</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fin &amp; Management</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAS</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Adjustments have been made for IA and FM, as Foundation Accounting (2 FT professionals) was transferred to F&M during this period; ISAS was formed after fall 2003, so personnel numbers are based on summing up the parts. The numbers for AA excludes faculty and Centers.

How can Buffalo State improve its competitive position when funding is flat and/or declining? It is pretty clear that Buffalo State, like higher education in general, made significant investments in areas not directly tied to instruction. For institutions to survive--for Buffalo State to survive, resources need to be reallocated over time to strengthen the core mission of the institution, teaching and learning. Buffalo State must transform itself. As the Transformation Working Group suggested, Buffalo State must transform teaching and learning, curriculum, administrative structures, processes, and culture. The over-arching goal of transformation should focus on curricular change to promote academic and institutional distinctiveness through: 1) adoption of all-college learning outcomes reflective of Buffalo State’s identity and values; and 2) discipline-appropriate high impact learning practices such as
internships, student research, service learning, global learning, field experiences, and culminating senior experiences in the curricula of all programs. (2014-17 Strategic Plan, Strategic Direction #4).

A partial review the institution (Academic Array--Strategic Direction #5) is not sufficient, because the majority of FT positions created over the past 18 years have been in areas outside of the core instructional budget. Buffalo State must engage in a comprehensive analysis of ALL administrative structures in an effort to create a collaborative environment that can more readily adapt to change, and, as a residual outcome, generate efficiencies. This document is an attempt to kick-start the process. To that end, the recommendations included here are driven by the following goals:

- Assessment standards for ALL functional areas.
- Transforming the curriculum by adopting all-college learning outcomes.
- Creating collaborative structures that support all-college learning outcomes and institutional distinctiveness.
- Moving to all-funds budgeting.

Assessment occurs at most levels of the institution, but there is little to no assessment of high-level administration, and rarely are major strategic investments or organizational change evaluated by basic cost-benefit analysis. Several SUNY institutions have instituted faculty assessments of high-level administrators via their campus governing bodies, and the University Faculty Senate has written a report (See Appendix for the full report) which provides guidelines for evaluation of upper level administration. As the UFS report suggests, assessment should be viewed as an attempt to strengthen the institution:

Evaluation of administrators by faculty works best when all parties involved consider it an attempt to improve the health and strength of the institution rather than targeting individuals. While administrators under review may not always be eager to embrace evaluation, they will accept it more readily when they perceive that the process is being administered fairly and that results generated are used to improve job performance...it is important to ground the process in campus bylaws or a similar document and to make the process as streamlined and minimally onerous as possible. In practice, some campus bylaws specify a general expectation and a process for administrative evaluation, leaving it to evaluation committees to generate the details, while other bylaws are quite full and prescriptive. But the important point is that there is a written, mutually-agreed on process in place. (p. 2)

It is not the intent of this report to evaluate administration, but we do believe the institution should adopt an assessment process for administrators, and it should be viewed with the intent of creating a more transparent culture. While we make no attempt to assess individuals, one of the primary tasks of this report is an assessment of Buffalo State’s last reorganization which occurred in 2004. The assessment of the 2004 re-organization, along with the goals outlined above, form the basis of the (main) recommendations in this report.
Section II: 2004 Reorganization

In 2004, Buffalo State College undertook a comprehensive self-examination that sought to provide avenues to “enhance our ability to deliver the current curriculum, foster collaboration across disciplines, and facilitate the development of innovative new degree programs” (April 15, 2004 Memo from President Muriel Howard). In addition, the report noted that “[O]ur infrastructure and support systems “must facilitate the recruitment, retention, and graduation of our students” (April 15, 2004 Memo).

The 2004 review process was undertaken for two primary reasons. First, the institution had gone almost 30 years without a comprehensive review of the college’s “overall structure for the delivery of curriculum and services” (September 16, 2004 Memo, Draft VI). The introduction to the draft report also noted that “[O]ver time, internal and external changes inevitably occur” and suggested that to stay relevant, institutions need regular self-studies. This statement referred not only to changes that occurred in higher education during the latter stages of the 20th century, but also to ongoing SUNY Mission Review processes mandated for all SUNY institutions.

Principal goals of the self-study were inspired by the College’s new Strategic Plan and focused attention of several areas, including:

- Strengthening graduate education by providing greater support for scholarships and creative activity,
- Enhancing the learning environment,
- Strengthening organizational effectiveness by streamlining processes and outcomes assessment,
- Facilitating partnerships and collaborations that support the college’s mission,
- Establishing an organizational structure and administrative systems that ensure academic success,
- Fostering collaboration across units and disciplines.

The plan offered to the college suggested that future discussions about institutional effectiveness were critical in shaping the institution and ensuring long-term viability. While it has not been 30 years since the last review, it is nonetheless time to evaluate the success of the re-organization efforts that occurred over ten years ago.

General Overview of Restructuring Efforts

- Re-organization of Student Affairs with the aim of creating better coordination between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs,
- Re-organization and Renaming of the Three Current Faculties, and
• Restructuring of Two Administrative Deans.

The re-organization of the three faculties (Faculty of Arts and Humanities; Faculty and Natural and Social Sciences; and Faculty of Applied Science and Education) created four schools:

• School of Arts and Humanities (107 FT Faculty; 1,953 UG majors; 283 Grad Students)
• School of the Professions (89 FT Faculty; 2,271 UG majors; 409 Grad Students)
• School of Education (63 FT Faculty; 1,090 UG majors; 966 Grad Students)
• School of Natural and Social Sciences (131 FT Faculty; 1,945 UG majors; 253 Grad Students).

In addition, the re-organization created two administrative schools, each with a dean. These were, along with their assigned areas:

• University College
  o First-year experience
  o Transition to college life
  o Retention and graduation
• Graduate Studies and Research
  o Development of sponsored programs to increase grant submissions and funding
  o Recruiting graduate students

Evaluation

While the restructuring document suggested that ongoing assessment of the benefits of the re-organization would take place, there has not been an extensive assessment to date. Although time is required to ensure that each of the schools and administrative areas has sufficient data to engage in a self-study, we are now ten years past restructuring, ensuring that enough evidence is available to clearly evaluate the success of the re-organization vis-à-vis its identified goals.

Evaluation Areas
• Four Schools
  • Success of the four schools to generate new and distinctive majors (including interdisciplinary programs)
  • Ability of the four schools to maintain enrollments for undergraduate and graduate programs
• University College
  • Improvement of Retention and Overall Graduate Rates
  • First-year Programs
  • Transition to College Life
• Graduate School
  • Development of Sponsored Programs
  • Recruiting graduate students
In the fall of 2004, the *Proposal for Future Directions and Student Success at Buffalo State College: Version 2*, was presented to the campus via a presidential memorandum (henceforth referred to as *Version 2 Report*). A significant goal of the restructuring process centered on creating four schools (A&H, SNSS, SOE, and SOP) from the three faculties (Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Faculty of Natural and Social Sciences, Faculty of Applied Sciences and Education) that existed. At that time (2004), the three standing Faculties enrolled approximately 9200 students in undergraduate and graduate programs. The distribution of students within the three Faculty can be found in Figure 2.1 – 2004 Student Enrollments by Faculty.

Upon re-alignment, the four new or re-organized schools hosted roughly equal numbers of student. Where significant differences occurred, such as between the new School of the Professions and the School of Education, one school housed substantially more graduate students than the other. For a more detailed look at student numbers in the four schools, please see Figure 2.2 – 2004 Enrollments in Four Schools.
Over time, enrollment trends at the undergraduate and graduate levels have resulted in unequal student numbers in each of the schools. As an example, the SOP now host 30% more than the next largest enrolled school – SNSS – and almost 370% of the total enrollment in the SOE. For additional information, please see Figure 2.3 – 2014 Student Enrollment, Four Schools.

Couched within the *Version 2 Report* was clear reference to the need to ensure that “program goals with regard to mission, enrollment, retention, and graduation” were met (p. 11). Ten years past the previous re-organization, it is clear that the equality of enrollments of enrollments within the four schools has not been maintained. Following national trends (See
Education Week, January 22, 2015), the SOE at Buffalo State has lost slightly more than 50% of its total enrollment while A&H is down about 8%. To the contrary, the SOP has increased total enrollments by approximately 41% and the SNSS, the only other school to increase enrollments, is up by about 25%.

In addition to creating roughly equal student enrollments, the 2004 restructuring program had important curriculum and programmatic goals, including:

- Creating clusters of disciplines that foster interactions in teaching, research, and service that revolve around shared interests and expertise,
- Creating opportunities of departments and programs to be more interdependent and interdisciplinary,
- Improving efficiency in sharing of resources, including space, facilities, equipment, and personnel, and
- Establishing interactions and collaborations that advance creation and delivery of new, innovative, and attractive academic offerings.

Since 2004, the number of majors and programs located on campus has grown from 79 to 171. Yet, among these only the Bachelor of Arts in Arts and Letters and the Bachelor of Sciences in Individualized Studies appear to be interdisciplinary in nature. At the graduate level, only the Multidisciplinary Masters and the recently proposed Urban Education Masters are interdisciplinary in nature.

### University College

The establishment of University College in the fall of 2004 highlighted the need for an administrative structure that encouraged coordination of first-year programs, transition to university life, and retention of first-year students. The Associate Vice-President for Undergraduate Education, then assigned directly to the Provost’s office, was re-assigned the position of Administrative Dean of University College and given, in addition to the charges listed above, responsibility for first-year writing, honors, international, and undergraduate research programs.

While little assessment of success in raising retention rates was carried out from 2004 to 2012, the recently (2012) concluded Buffalo State College self-study, undertaken as part of the Middle State reaccreditation process, looked closely at the role of University College and its impact on retention and graduate rates. The report states:

---

4 This represents the number of undergraduate majors and programs listed in the 2004 Buffalo State College catalog. The Buffalo State College Fact Book breaks down the programs differently, suggesting approximately 130 programs.
First-year retention rates range from 70.5 percent to 77.9 percent during 1999–2009, with no clear trends during this period. An increase in four-year graduation rates since 2003 is evident (from 14.3–15.7 percent on average to 20.7–22.85 percent on average); however, note that UC was formed one year after cumulative graduation rates began to increase. Cumulative six-year graduation rates ranged from 42.2 percent to 48.1 percent during 2000–2005; after the formation of UC in 2004, six-year graduation rates were 46.8 percent for two consecutive years, which was within the range of values for 2000–2005. In summary, the analysis suggests that UC may be having positive effects on student satisfaction, especially with respect to course registration and academic advisement; however, no clear improvement in first-year retention rates associated with the formation of UC is evident, and although four-year graduation rates have increased since 2003, the increase began one year before UC was created. Cumulative six-year graduation rates have remained in the range of 42.2–48.1 percent since 2000, again showing no clear impact of UC on these rates. Hence, while UC’s programs may be contributing to higher graduation rates for students entering Buffalo State from 2004 onward, it is also likely that other factors are playing an important role (Striving for Excellence in a Time of Transition - Middle States Self-Study, 2013, p. 42).

Looking at data available from Institutional Resources and the Office of Admissions, a more detailed analysis of retention and graduation rates can be found. The retention of students from their initial fall term to the subsequent spring has consistently hovered between 87% and 91%. Please see Figure 2.4 – First Fall to Spring Retention Rates.

**Figure 2.4 – First Fall to Spring Retention Rates**

Student retention from the end of their first academic year to the beginning of the next, often referred to as “First Fall to Second Fall Retention Rates,” has likewise remained within the
narrow range of 75% to 80% with most years experiencing retention rates in the mid-70% range. Please see Figure 2.5 - First Fall to Second Fall Retention Rates.

**Figure 2.5 – First Fall to Second Fall Retention Rates**

And finally, while four-year graduate rates have climbed from about 15% to approximately 25%, there is little indication, as the Middle States report suggested, that UNC has played a singular role in increasing these percentages. Please see Figure 2.6 – Four-Year Graduation Rates.

**Figure 2.6 – Four-Year Graduation Rates**

More telling, perhaps, are data linked to graduation rates for students who entered Buffalo State with declared schools and majors. For students who entered with UNC as their declared home school, only 39% graduate in five years. This is significantly below the next lowest school,
SOP, which graduates over 54% of its students in 5 years. See Figure 2.7 – Graduation Rates by Initially Declared Schools and College.\(^5\)

**Figure 2.7 – (Transfer) Graduation Rates by Initially Declared Schools and College**

It is important to note that the 2004 restructuring process created a graduate school that is primarily administrative. All academic responsibilities for graduate program curricula and standards was left within each school and more specifically each program/department.

Given these changes, the success of the second administrative school is hard to evaluate. Yet, several important data points are clear. First, enrollment planning at Buffalo State placed equal importance on the recruitment of undergraduate and graduate students. In each area, planners anticipated a 3.5% growth from 2008/09 to 2013/14. See Figure 2.8 - Projected Graduate School Population.

**Figure 2.8- Projected Graduate School Population**

\(^5\) One-year retention rates within students’ initially declared schools and college ranged from a low of 68.3% in University College to a high of 85.6% in the School of Education. Retention and Graduation Report, IR.
Since 2006, however, campus-based graduate student enrollment has steadily declined from slightly over 1900 to under 1200 – a 40% reduction in the graduate student population. See Figure 2.9 – Graduate Student Enrollment from 2006 to 2014.

Figure 2.9 – Graduate Student Enrollment from 2006 to 2014

As Figure 2.10 to 2.13 suggest, only graduate enrollments in the School of Natural and Social Sciences increased from 2006 to 2014. This 25% increase was offset by significant declines in Arts and Humanities (-60%), Education (-50%), and Professions (-30%).

Figure 2.10 – Graduate Enrollments, SNSS

---

6 The number of graduate students in this report do not include students enrolled in ______ program.
In addition, from at least 2010 to the present, graduate student waivers have remained stagnant at $281,500 per year. See Figure 2.14 - Graduate Student Waivers, 2010 – 2014.
Summary: It is clear that the 2004 re-organization did not achieve its stated goals. In addition, enrollments within the schools have changed dramatically over the past 10 years, and the number of majors in the existing four academic schools are no longer aligned. The creation of more academic silos has also not engendered greater collaboration. University College has had no measured impact on retention rates, and (possibly) a marginally positive impact on graduation rates. In the next section we provide recommendations for new administrative structures.

Section III: Recommendations

To reiterate, we do not believe the 2004 re-organization achieved its stated goals. In addition, a 21st century education focused on all-college learning outcomes requires greater breadth—it should be more interdisciplinary in nature. If the curriculum requires greater collaboration among disciplines, then administrative structures must also become more collaborative to facilitate change. The intent of the following recommendations is to initiate a much needed discussion by all constituents @Buffalo State.

Recommendation 1: Two-School Structure

The primary recommendation in this report is to collapse the four academic schools into a two-school structure. The adoption of all-college learning outcomes implies the elimination of the majority of required individual coursework. We envision a school of applied programs, which would merge SOE and SOP; and a school of Arts & Sciences which would merge SAH and SNSS. The two school structure creates a relatively close realignment of majors based on fall 2014 data (Figure 3.1).
All-college learning outcomes suggest the need for collaborative programs to meet learning outcomes not met within the major program curriculum. With the reduction in required individual courses associated with Intellectual Foundations, students will have additional capacity to complete minors and/or double majors. In order to meet broad learning outcomes, we can envision a curriculum that requires majors in the applied school to minor in the Arts & Sciences, and vice versa. Departments with large numbers of majors might collaborate with departments across the schools to create tailored or themed programs to meet learning outcomes not attained in the major.

Administratively, with the larger composition of each school, it would be necessary to retain all associate deans related to each of the former four schools. Regarding academic departments, we assume there are forthcoming recommendations based on the Academic Array review. We agree, given the number of departments, there is a need to create efficiencies. While FTE is one metric to drive decision-making, an alternative would be to create groupings based on programmatic commonalities—academic “hubs”. Some obvious groupings are education, science, and technology. Reducing the number of departments/chairs, while creating some financial savings, puts more full time faculty back in the classroom.

There are some efficiency gains based on two fewer deans and possibly in office staffing.

**Recommendation 2: Merge Graduate Office Administrative Unit with Enrollment Management and Elevate EM to Cabinet-level**

Currently, Enrollment Management directly reports to the Vice President of Student Affairs. Given the strategic importance of enrollment to the campus budget, we recommend that
Enrollment Management be elevated to a cabinet-level position. In addition, with academic responsibilities for graduate program curricula and standards “administered” within each academic school, office administrative responsibilities should be transferred to Enrollment Management. We are not suggesting elimination of a titular head (graduate dean), rather we envision graduate (as well as undergraduate) education as part of an expanded role for the Associate Provost position (see revised organizational chart for AA).

There most likely are no efficiency gains as the AV Provost also holds the title of Graduate Dean, and the AVP will have significantly more responsibilities.

**Recommendation 3: Dismantling Current University College Structure to Focus on Academic Rigor & Support**

In order to maintain enrollments, Buffalo State’s freshman profile has changed dramatically. In 2012, 24% of the freshman class was categorized as “less selective,” while almost 50% of the 2014 freshman class falls under the less selective category. Given this trend, the institution will need more resources to support the greater number of students who are less academically prepared. As discussed in Section 2, University College has not met the goals outlined in the 2004 re-organization proposals; therefore, we recommend dismantling University College to address the growing need for academic support, with the core parts of UC related to student support marshalled into an “Office of Academic Rigor and Standards” (see revised organizational chart for AA). In addition, we recommend all programs across administrative units related to academic student support report to this unit (e.g. the Writing Center and the Office of Student Success).

Offices and programs not related to academic support (First-year and international programs, CASTL, Service Learning, Honors, etc.) would be placed under the auspices of “undergraduate education, and the College Writing Program would be moved back under supervision of the English Department.

There may be some efficiency gains from this re-organization, but some of the administration and staffing would be redistributed across the proposed re-organization in AA.

**Recommendation 4: Move Housing and Food Services to Finance & Management**

In order to effectuate all-funds budgeting and centralize management of private and state-supported housing, financial management of housing would be moved to Finance & Management. In addition, Food Services would also be moved to F&M.

There are no efficiency gains, rather these shifts facilitate the move toward all-funds budgeting.
Recommendation 5: Re-focusing Student Affairs toward Campus Life Reporting to Academic Affairs

With Enrollment Management elevated to a cabinet position, and food/housing services moved to Finance & Management, Student Affairs would be refocused on campus life. Given the reduced responsibilities and a sharper focus on student life, and to enhance the collaboration between these areas, we recommend the creation of the combined position AVP & Dean of Students reporting to the provost.

As part of the reorganization of Student Affairs, we recommend moving the Burchfield Penney Art Center and connecting it to the School of Arts & Sciences. The BPAC collaborates on programming with a significant number of academic departments across campus, so it makes more sense to connect BPAC with an academic school. While we do not want to limit the collaborations by tying BPAC to one school, at the moment the majority of collaborations occur with departments in the School of Arts & Sciences (See proposed AA organizational chart).

There are some efficiency gains associated with combining the VP and Dean of Students position and offices.

**ISAS**

While ISAS did not experience an increase in personnel since the 2004 re-organization, Computing Services did experience a significant investment in over the five-year period from 1998 to 2003. The number of FT staff in Computing Services has more than doubled since 1998, increasing from 27 to the current 60. A significant number of personnel were hired during this 5-year period in support of developing the SABRE Student Records System. Once SABRE was abandoned in favor of BANNER, programmers hired in support of SABRE were retained and re-assigned. Library services have also changed dramatically as the majority of resources are now accessed online. On the other hand, the demand for instructional technology support for online or hybrid instruction is growing.

Given the adoption of BANNER and the rapid changes in technology over the past 10 years, we recommend an external assessment of campus technology support needs in order to determine if current resources are efficiently deployed.

**Institutional Advancement**

A significant amount of personnel and dollars was invested in IA beginning in 2004-05. The number of FT staff increased from 25 to 36 (Table 1.2), a 44% increase, and most of the investment was made with state purpose dollars. As we recommend for all administrative areas, there should be an assessment of the investment for the ten-year period involved (for example, a simple metric of “return on dollars invested” could be used).
Currently IA has a targeted goal to raise $5.2 million across all areas of giving (President’s Cabinet Goals 2014-15), and we look forward to assessment of this--and all--cabinet goals during the fall 2015 semester.

Finally, while one of the stated goals of IA is to provide increased scholarship and student support, Buffalo State should assess the current level of awards relative to our competition. Over the past five years, the value of scholarship awards has stagnated while the cost of tuition and fees have increased. Table 3.1 shows that total costs have increased by almost 24% while scholarship awards are unchanged. In fact, the Dean, Provost, and President Awards have not changed since their inception, F08, F06, and F02 respectively.

### Table 3.1 Tuition/Fees/Room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>$4,970</td>
<td>$5,270</td>
<td>$5,570</td>
<td>$5,870</td>
<td>$6,170</td>
<td>$6,470</td>
<td>30.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>$1,083</td>
<td>$1,083</td>
<td>$1,124</td>
<td>$1,152</td>
<td>$1,177</td>
<td>$1,199</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room and Board</td>
<td>$10,168</td>
<td>$10,240</td>
<td>$11,002</td>
<td>$11,288</td>
<td>$11,964</td>
<td>$12,413</td>
<td>22.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$16,221</td>
<td>$16,593</td>
<td>$17,696</td>
<td>$18,310</td>
<td>$19,311</td>
<td>$20,082</td>
<td>23.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>-0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% covered</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>-0.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>-1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% covered</td>
<td>6.16%</td>
<td>6.03%</td>
<td>5.65%</td>
<td>5.46%</td>
<td>5.18%</td>
<td>4.98%</td>
<td>-1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>-1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% covered</td>
<td>9.25%</td>
<td>9.04%</td>
<td>8.48%</td>
<td>8.19%</td>
<td>7.77%</td>
<td>7.47%</td>
<td>-1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors and Prov</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>-4.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% covered</td>
<td>21.58%</td>
<td>21.09%</td>
<td>19.78%</td>
<td>19.12%</td>
<td>18.12%</td>
<td>17.43%</td>
<td>-4.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors and Pres</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>-4.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% covered</td>
<td>24.66%</td>
<td>24.11%</td>
<td>22.60%</td>
<td>21.85%</td>
<td>20.71%</td>
<td>19.92%</td>
<td>-4.74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For fall 2015
- Dean scholarship will cover 2.49% of tuition/ fees/ room and board
- Provost scholarship will cover 4.98% of tuition/ fees/ room and board
- Presidential scholarship will cover 7.47% of tuition/ fees/ room and board
- Honors with a Provost scholarship will cover 17.43% of tuition/ fees/ room and board
- Honors with a Presidential scholarship will cover 19.92% of tuition/ fees/ room and board--close to a 5% drop since the 24.66% coverage back in 2010.

For award information on some of Buffalo State’s competitors, we include information from an informal survey of scholarship offers performed by UB in Appendix 2.
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Faculty Evaluation of Administrators

A Report by the Governance Committee
Of the SUNY University Faculty Senate
Presented to the Winter Plenary
2005

Scope of the Report

This report draws primarily on resources from within SUNY, readily available information from the work of the Governance Committee, from campus bylaws and governance websites, and system documents. Other sources include interviews and written exchanges with SUNY faculty and staff at selected campuses where faculty evaluation of administrators has been taking place on a regular basis or at least sporadically, but no attempt has been made to contact every SUNY unit. The objective is to identify what works and has worked best within these existing evaluations. As explained below, the primary emphasis of this report is on faculty evaluation of administrators below the level of campus president.

Rationale

Over at least the last decade, a movement towards greater accountability and transparency has occurred in higher education as elsewhere, and faculty evaluation of administrators is one response to this increased expectation. To state the obvious, evaluation of job performance exists throughout institutions of higher learning: faculty evaluate student performance, faculty themselves generally invite student evaluations and are themselves subject to rigorous peer and institutional review for tenure, promotion, and merit awards, and the SUNY Chancellor (see below) institutes regular evaluation of campus presidents. Faculty evaluation of senior administration should not be confused with “line review” performed within administration itself, nor should “line review” be used to foreclose faculty evaluation of administration. Often while “line review” involves some faculty input, the faculty does not initiate the process, it usually does not participate broadly, nor does it have “ownership” of the process.

The Chancellor’s Review Cycle of SUNY College Presidents

The Chancellor has initiated a regular review of campus presidents. But because initiation and “ownership” of the process does not specifically reside with local faculty, we have regarded it as outside the scope of this report. The Chancellor’s review is described in “Guidelines for Presidential Reviews & Evaluations at State-Operated Campuses.” This document describes an annual review process that does not require a
faculty role and a periodic full scale formal evaluation, typically at the three year point (new presidents) or at five years (continuing presidents) which does solicit faculty involvement. A “senior faculty member” may be invited to serve on the Evaluation Team and the Chancellor “will invite…governance leaders…to submit written comments on the quality of the President’s stewardship” but the “Guidelines” do not stipulate campus-wide faculty input, though in practice this seems to have occurred at most campuses where the formal review has taken place. The “Guidelines” also require that “requests for comments regarding Presidential stewardship shall be considered confidential.”

Results of Governance Committee Survey

In the academic year 2002-3, the Governance Committee conducted a survey of 27 SUNY campuses to determine the extent to which these campuses had procedures in place for faculty to evaluate senior administrators (dean and above). Of the 24 campuses responding, just over half indicated that guidelines for evaluation were “in place,” but a large majority of campuses reported that there was “little or no role for faculty governance in evaluation of senior administrators,” which is consistent with the findings of this report that while guidelines may be in place, they are often not implemented on a regular basis or at all. The Governance Committee Survey noted that “The key factor in determining whether faculty at an institution has a meaningful role seems to be the sense that the faculty has of itself.” Campuses that have a strong faculty culture which values independence and stewardship are more likely to press for a faculty prerogative to evaluate administration.

General Observations

Evaluation of administrators by faculty works best when all parties involved consider it an attempt to improve the health and strength of the institution rather than targeting individuals. While administrators under review may not always be eager to embrace evaluation, they will accept it more readily when they perceive that the process is being administered fairly and that results generated are used to improve job performance. (At least one SUNY institution solicits a faculty recommendation for or against an administrator’s retention, but this is the exception rather than the rule.)

Because administrative evaluation is a sporadic process often performed by ad hoc committees monitored by frequently-shifting governance leadership, it is important to ground the process in campus bylaws or a similar document and to make the process as streamlined and minimally onerous as possible. In practice, some campus bylaws specify a general expectation and a process for administrative evaluation, leaving it to evaluation committees to generate the details, while other bylaws are quite full and prescriptive. But the important point is that there is a written, mutually-agreed on process in place.
Oversight

It is most important that the practice of faculty evaluation of administrators be monitored by an individual or individuals who is not a member of the evaluating committee and who is directly answerable to the faculty and professional staff and ultimately to the larger college community. In practice this is typically the campus governance leader working in cooperation with the governance executive committee. While generally not participating in the evaluation, these individuals will typically initiate the evaluation of specific individuals on a regular basis as determined by the faculty bylaws and will provide oversight for the process.

The Evaluation Committee

In practice the size and composition of the evaluation committee vary considerably according to the size and complexity of the campus. Some variations include an evaluation committee which reproduces the representation of the search committee for the position under review. A more comprehensive model designates an evaluation coordinator for the entire campus with small, individual committees for each division or school. The campus representing this model produces a comprehensive review of university programs and services and all senior administrators on a biennial basis. Another model establishes a coordinating committee overseeing departmental evaluation committees which do the actual evaluation and then report back to the coordinating committee. But a common feature of all evaluation committees is that they represent all sectors affected by the policy and decisions of the individual under review. Generally, evaluation committees are elected, but in some instances they are appointed by the CGL alone or consulting with the local senate executive committee.

The Evaluation Cycle

Most bylaws or governing documents specify that senior administrators be evaluated every three to five years. (Although one campus is attempting biannual or even annual evaluations of all senior administrators.) However, it is increasing practice that senior administration positions are filled as interim appointments which are typically not evaluated. Additionally, administrative terms are often shorter than previously because of increasing mobility and volatility in higher educational administration. Both realities often delay and complicate faculty evaluation. One suggestion is to move up the first evaluation to, for example, the second year of service. It has been noted that new faculty are typically reviewed in their first year of performance, with the information then available. The goal is that evaluation occur in a timely way to affect and enhance individual and institutional performance.
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Initiating Evaluation

In practical terms, this is one of the greatest obstacles to faculty evaluation of administrators. While bylaws may require the process to take place, an individual or individuals needs to initiate the process. Governance leadership changes, often frequently; no formal training for the position of CGL takes place, and knowledge of policy and governance documents varies considerably from individual to individual and often takes time to acquire. Additionally, different “leadership styles” prevail and often if the CGL perceives resistance to faculty evaluation from the college administration, the easiest course is to simply ignore or defer the practice. There is no easy solution to this problem, but one campus has a published record of the evaluation cycle, and the governance secretary simply informs all parties at the beginning of the academic year that a review is required for specific individuals.

The Evaluation “Instrument”

In practice, survey instruments vary as much as the composition of the evaluation committee. Standard evaluation formats are available (see D. Sharon Miller et al. following), and they invite respondents to rate job performance according to key categories such as “communication skills,” “leadership,” “organizational skills” etc. Others are highly particularized for aspects of job performance that are specific to a particular position and may not apply to all administrative positions (i.e. “purchasing of equipment and supplies”). The advantage of a standard form is that it requires less of the evaluation committees and therefore makes it more likely that the process will be accomplished, but it will also yield less precise information about performance. One campus includes a standard evaluation instrument on its governance webpage, with the invitation that specific committees adapt or modify it as necessary. Most instruments examined invite a combination of quantified and written responses. Increasingly, surveys are web-based with obvious advantages in respect to collection of information. However some caveats apply: safeguards need to be put in place to prevent multiple responses from a single individual. Procedures need to be established to ensure that only members of the evaluation committee have access to the collected information.

Dissemination on Information Collected

Typically, the evaluation committee will have received supporting documentation from the individual being evaluated, which it will take into account in preparing its report. The evaluation committee is also responsible for tabulating quantifiable results and editing prose comments to remove potentially scurrilous responses. What happens after this point varies considerably. In some instances, only the committee, the individual evaluated and his or her immediate supervisor see the survey data. In other cases, a summary is presented to the CGL and the executive committee; it may also be placed in a public place such as the campus library. Before the summary is prepared, the individual evaluated may have the opportunity to respond in writing to the results of the
survey, and these comments may be acknowledged in the committee report. At one campus, the tabulated responses and edited, selected prose comments are placed on the restricted campus website for all members of the university community to access. Whatever method of dissemination is employed is obviously a function of local practice and negotiation, but where faculty and professional staff see none of the results of the evaluations, a sense of mistrust and futility may result. Consequently, it is recommended that individuals participating in the survey have access to some version of the results, even if it is only an edited summary.

Conclusion

The opportunity to evaluate senior college administrators is an important faculty prerogative, which, if pursued carefully, can give faculty a stronger sense of participation in the governance of the college. The first step in establishing the process as a regular feature of academic practice is to convince all parties, administrators and faculty alike, that the goal, beyond the personalities involved, is finally institutional improvement, and that the considerable work involved for faculty is worth undertaking. The University Faculty Senate can take on an important role in affirming the importance of faculty evaluation of administrators by encouraging Campus Governance Leaders to revisit mechanisms for evaluation which may already be in place at their campuses, or where none exist, to examine the practices at those campuses which are successfully accomplishing this goal and, as necessary, adapt them to their own needs.
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Foundation documents

http://www(aaup.org/governance/index.htm

--------------------------------------------------------. “Evaluation of Administrators.” (AAUP Policy documents and reports, 1984) as displayed on the Canadian Organization of Faculty Association Staff’s website.
http://www.caut.ca/cuasa/cofas/Documents/aaup-admin-eval.html


This substantial 81 page document “provides guidelines and sample forms and instruments to help in the development of a system for evaluating community college administrators.” Included is a sample evaluation instrument which has been adapted by SUNY Binghamton and can be found online at:
http://facultysenate.binghamton.edu/completeECCchargeandprocedures.htm


--------------------------------------------------------. “Policies of the Board of Trustees, 2001, Article VI (University Faculty) Section 3 (Responsibilities).”
http://www.suny.edu/Board_of_Trustees/PDF/Policies.pdf

University Faculty Senate Governance Committee. “Role of Faculty in Evaluation of Senior Administrators at SUNY Campuses.” Survey conduced by a subcommittee of the SUNY Faculty Senate Governance Committee 2002-3.

Journal articles


[http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_higher_education/v074/74.1.rosser.pdf](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/journal_of_higher_education/v074/74.1.rosser.pdf)

**Websites**


Canadian Organization of Faculty Association Staff.  
[http://www.caut.ca/cuasa/cofas/](http://www.caut.ca/cuasa/cofas/), especially its Document Archive which contains links to policy and procedure documents from selected academic institutions  

**SUNY Campuses which conduct regular faculty evaluation of administrators.**

This list is *not intended to be exhaustive*, and the Governance Committee solicits information from other SUNY campuses which engage in regular evaluation or which have policy / procedures in place that may be helpful to other SUNY units:

SUNY Binghamton  
SUNY Fredonia  
SUNY New Paltz  
SUNY Stonybrook
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Informal UB Survey of SUNY Scholarship Awards

SUNY University at Buffalo

- 25 Presidential Scholarships covering full tuition, fees, housing, board, books for 4 years. Minimum average 95, SAT/ACT 1470/33.
- UB attracts academically talented freshmen from across the country and supports their learning experience with two- and four-year merit-based scholarships starting at $2,500 up to the total cost of attendance, depending on academic performance and residency. This year, the university awarded more than $3.5 million in merit-based scholarships to incoming freshmen.

SUNY Purchase

- Up to 20 Presidential Scholarship of $3,000 in-state and $4,000 out-of-state for Liberal Arts & Sciences Freshmen, minimum average 90, SAT 1200.
- Institutional Scholarships and the maximum we offer is full tuition approximately $14,000.00 or a minimum of $3,000.00 to eligible applicants.

SUNY Oswego

- Possibility Scholarship Program - enroll up to 10 freshmen each fall- the award combines need-based and institutional aid to provide a fully funded four year experience to low income (efc 1000 or less), highly academically talented (avg gpa 94, avg SAT 1250) students interested in a stem field. The award also funds an international study experience and an on campus research experience for each student.
- We award about $4 million in merit scholarships to Oswego students each fall. In addition, students receive over $80 million in financial aid annually through various grants, loans, work-study programs and scholarships.

http://www.oswego.edu/admissions/undergraduate/freshmen/Merit_Scholarships.htm

Cayuga Community College

- Full Tuition Presidential Scholarship to the top 20% of high school graduates in Cayuga/Oswego Counties, up to 4 semesters. Books/fees not included. Must be Full Time and maintain 3.0 GPA.
Clinton Community College

- Presidential Scholarship offered to Clinton County, Hamilton County, St. Lawrence County or Saratoga County High School graduates with cumulative average of 90 or above. Tuition-only for up to 2 years of consecutive study. Must earn a 2.75 GPA or higher in first semester and 3.25 or higher in subsequent semesters.

SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry

- Presidential Scholarship of $3000 to NY State students and $8000 nonresidents.

SUNY State College of Optometry

- No full tuition scholarships. Merit based awards available, $5000-$10,000 for 1 year.

SUNY Canton

- $5000 Presidential Scholarship renewable for up to 4 years and paired automatically with endowed scholarship of $1538. Minimum average 94, SAT/ACT 1200/25. Must live on campus. 2 awarded annually.

SUNY Albany

- Merit awards of $4300 for instate residents and $7000 for domestic out of state (not international). Minimum average 90, SAT 1250.

SUNY Ulster –

- We offer full tuition scholarships to students who graduate in the top 10% of their high school class. There is no limit to the number of students who may receive this.

SUNY Oneonta

- Awarded nearly $4 million in scholarships this past academic year. SUNY Oneonta Admissions Office awards $1,000 to $6,470 in scholarships to students who demonstrate an exceptional level of academic achievement.
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Proposed Re-organization of Academic Affairs
Proposed Reorganization – Senior Administration
Proposed Reorganization – Finance and Management

AVP, F & M

Vice President, Finance & Management

Senior Assistant

University Police
Housing
Campus Food Services
Sponsored Programs
Comptroller

Human Resource Management

Budget Office
Director of College Accounting

Parking Services
Procurement Services and Contracts
Student Accounts
IFR and Recharge Accounting

Payroll Manager

Campus Services
Events Management
Design and Construction Management
Facilities Planner
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