EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Long Island University 2002/2003 Decennial Self-Study: "Excellence and Access"

A university on the move, Long Island University is one of the most ethnically diverse institutions of higher learning in America today, and is committed to providing "excellence and access" in private higher education to students of all backgrounds and means in their quests to realize the American Dream. The institution has now grown to become the nation's seventh-largest, private, non-profit university, and annually educates more than 30,000 traditional and non-traditional students in credit and non-credit programs. Through its three residential and three regional campuses, it offers more than 500 academic programs and awards degrees at all levels through the doctorate. The University also conducts instruction on ships in both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and operates academic centers around the world in connection with its Friends World Program of Global Education. Long Island 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 last decennial Middle States review was conducted in 1993, and its accreditation status was most recently reaffirmed by the Middle States Commission in 1998.

A Decade of Stability and Change

The ten year period since the institution's last Middle States decennial review in 1993 has been a time characterized both by a high degree of stability in vision and leadership and by significant change in programs and facilities.

The University's historic vision of providing high-quality private collegiate education to people "from all walks of life" was reaffirmed in the restatement of its "Excellence and Access" mission last year and continues to guide and sustain the institution. Its administrative and academic leadership have also been highly stable, enabling the institution to maintain a clear focus and consistent vision as it has advanced. The University President is now in his 18th year in office; the Vice President for Finance is completing her 57th year of service; the Provost of the Brooklyn Campus is in her 30th year, and the Vice President for Legal Services & University Counsel is in his 30th year of service at Long Island University. The Vice President for Academic Affairs (whose service to the institution began as Dean of Education at the C.W. Post Campus), the Provost of the C.W. Post Campus, the Vice President for Information Systems & University Planning have all served in the University's leadership during at least seven of the past ten years, and the Vice President for University Relations is completing his fourth year in office. During nine of the past ten years, Southampton College was led by a Provost who completed almost three decades of University service before leaving in Fall 2002 upon his election to the United States Congress. A national search for that critical leadership position has just been completed, and a new Provost is expected to be appointed for Southampton College during Spring 2003. Additionally, most of the academic deans across the University have led their respective schools or colleges for many years and none has less than four years of service to the institution.

The past decade has also been a time of substantial growth, investment and improvement at Long Island University. Credit-bearing, headcount enrollment has increased by 18 percent over the decade. Student quality and the quality of the educational and co-curricular experience at Long Island University have continued to improve throughout the past decade. Participation in the University's award-winning Honors Programs increased on all campuses (especially at the Brooklyn and C.W. Post Campuses), and many students earned academic honors and recognition (including many Fulbright scholarships awarded to students from Southampton College). Almost half (49 percent) of the University's current full-time faculty members have been appointed in the past ten years, and many new degree programs have been added while others have been discontinued or revised. The curricula of all the University's Teacher Education and Certification programs were completely rewritten and have been re-approved by the New York State Education Department during the past two years. New doctoral programs have been added in Information Studies, Pharmacy, Pharmaceutics, and Physical Therapy, and many academic programs have received new or continuing specialized accreditation or recognition in their disciplines and professional fields (e.g., AACSB, NASPAA, and ALA). Responsibility for Continuing Education was decentralized from University Center to the residential campuses in 2002. New buildings have been constructed on all three of the residential campuses, and the book value of the University's physical plant has more than doubled during the period. Private giving, sponsored funding and other external support have increased dramatically, and the University's endowment has grown by 123 percent over the decade.

Self-Study Process, Organization and Goals, and Report

The opportunity provided by the Middle States Self-Study process to reflect on the University's continuing mission and vision, to review the effects of significant changes in its programs and activities, and to conduct an intensive, comprehensive, institutional self-assessment of the institution's achievements and continuing challenges was embraced by the entire University community.

Drawing from the University's revised mission and vision statements developed during the early stages of the Self-Study process, the University-wide Steering Committee selected "Excellence and Access" as the theme of the Self-Study. Much more than a motto, this theme reflects the mission and core values of the institution across all of its campuses and programs. It provided the ultimate standard against which the University judged its success and progress and identified opportunities for improvement and advancement.

Each of the campus-level Accreditation Review Committees identified specific goals and objectives for the campus-level components of this Self-Study, and those are described in the campus-specific volumes of this report. In addition, the University sought to achieve the following overall goals and objectives from this Self-Study process:

- 1. Assess and revise, in light of the progress of the institution and changes in its environment over the past decade, the University's vision, mission and current goals, which guide the University in all of its activities and programs;
- 2. Identify those qualities which bind the elements of this geographically-diverse, multicampus, complex University together into a cohesive whole greater than its parts, and

- determine how those qualities may be strengthened and enhanced for the greater good of the overall institution and its several campuses and specialized programs. Also identify the value to be derived from sharing academic programming and resources across campuses;
- 3. Assess the performance and effectiveness of the overall institution beyond the performance of its individual campuses on each of the standards set forth in the *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education* (1994) of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. Those standards, modified to meet the specific needs of this Self-Study, are:
 - Mission, Goals and Objectives
 - Institutional Integrity
 - Students, Campus Life, Cultural Activities and Athletics
 - Faculty
 - Educational Program and Curricula
 - Library, Educational Technology and Other Learning Resources
 - Facilities, Information Technology, Equipment and Other Resources
 - Institutional Effectiveness and Outcomes
 - Strategic Planning and Resource Allocation
 - Financial Resources and Development
 - Organization, Administration and Governance
 - Governing Board
 - Alumni and Community Relations, Marketing, Catalogs and Publications
 - Institutional Change and Renewal
- 4. Provide a formal opportunity for members of the University community to renew and strengthen their dedication to the institution's mission and their personal roles in working on their home campuses and across campuses to advance that mission;
- 5. Engage the entire University community in a process of critical and rigorous institutional self-reflection leading to the identification of opportunities for continued improvement in institutional, campus and personal effectiveness; and
- 6. Identify unmet challenges and new opportunities that will lead to positive change in the institution and a greater capacity to fulfill its special obligations as one of the nation's ten largest private, non-profit institutions of higher learning.

The Self-Study process was conducted over a period of almost two years and involved extensive participation by dozens of committees, subcommittees and task forces comprising several hundred faculty members, administrators, trustees, students, alumni and community members, representing perspectives and interests from every part of the University community. The process was overseen by a 47-member University-wide Middle States Steering Committee, co-chaired by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Information Systems and University Planning and including the leadership of the several campus Accreditation Review committees. The process at each of the three residential campuses was directed by a campus-based Accreditation Review Committee, and the effort at the three regional campuses was directed by a single Regional Campuses Accreditation Review Committee. Each of the Accreditation Review committees established subcommittees and task forces organized generally around the 14 *Characteristics of Excellence*.

The Self-Study report, in its five volumes, represents only a small fraction of the analytic documents produced in the institution's self-assessment, but the full inventory of supporting materials will be made available to the Middle States Visiting Team in resource rooms at University Center and on the campuses. Major portions of the University-wide sections of Volume 1 were written or edited by: Dr. Jeffrey Kane (Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Professor of Education); Dr. R. H. Red Owl (Vice President for Information Systems & University Planning, and Professor of Education); Mrs. Mary M. Lai (Vice President for Finance & Treasurer); Mr. Richard Gorman (Vice President for University Relations); Dr. Lori Knapp (Associate Vice President for Outcomes Assessment & Program Review, and Professor of Nursing); Mr. George Baroudi (Associate Vice President for Information Technology), Dr. Michael M. Byrne (Associate Vice President for Information Systems, and Professor of Education); Dr. Nishan Najarian (Associate Vice President for Distance Education and International Programs); Dr. Donald Ungarelli (University Dean of Libraries); Ms. Cynthia Boehlke (Associate Vice President for Capital Campaigns & Planning Giving); Ms. Paola Curcio-Kleinman (Associate Vice President for Marketing & Public Relations); Ms. Syria Carrington (University Director of Institutional Research); Ms. Heather Gibbs (University Director of Information Training); and Ms. Christine Gonzalez-Abenes (Executive Assistant to the Vice President for Information Systems & University Planning). The primary authors/editors of the Brooklyn Campus section in Volume 2 are: Dr. Alfred DiMaio (Professor of Political Science); Dr. David Cohen (Dean of Arts and Sciences); and Dr. Gladys Schrynemakers (Assistant Provost). The primary authors/editors of the C.W. Post Campus section in Volume 3 are: Dr. Margaret Boorstein (Professor of Geology); Dr. Pamela Lennox (Associate Provost); and Dr. Lori Knapp (Associate Vice President for Outcomes Assessment & Program Review, and Professor of Nursing). The primary authors/editors of the Southampton College section in Volume 4 are: Dr. Charles Hitchcock (Dean of the College); Dr. Paul Forestell (Professor of Psychology/Biology); Mr. Michael Brophy (former Associate Provost and Dean of Students); Dr. Margaret Madden (former Dean of the College); and Mr. James Larocca (former Dean of the College). The primary authors/editors of the Regional Campuses section in Volume 5 are: Dr. Sylvia Blake (Associate Provost, Westchester Graduate Campus); Ms. Nancy Low-Hogan (Associate Provost, Rockland Graduate Campus); and Ms. Marlyne Hynds (Associate Provost, Brentwood Campus). Dozens of other committee, task force and subcommittee chairs and members, too numerous to name here, also contributed narratives to the report.

Conclusions and Recommendations for the Future

While the Self-Study process identified almost 600 specific, significant institutional strengths, weaknesses and recommendations (presented in Volume 1) and dozens of others contained in supporting reports, several overarching, general conclusions emerged from the analyses and discussions and are highlighted below.

1. Long Island University is stronger and healthier than it has been at any other point in its 76-year history. It remains faithful to the values of "Excellence and Access" in private higher education and has made great progress in fulfilling that mission. Its enrollments are growing and the quality and diversity of its student body are increasing. Its faculty are well qualified and deeply committed to teaching, research and service. Its facilities are adequate; many new buildings have been constructed; and the Board of Trustees has approved a Capital Plan that will ensure continued

improvements to the physical plant. It financial position is sound, its fiscal outlook is positive, and the potential for significant increases in external funding through the Capital Campaign and other ongoing development efforts is great. Its technology and information system resources have been expanded, and a new Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system to integrate its data systems and improve its business practices is planned to be implemented over the next three years.

- 2. The University has made progress but has not yet sufficiently identified, understood and communicated those qualities which bind together the elements of a geographically-diverse, multi-campus, complex institution into a cohesive whole greater than its parts. The University leadership must continue its efforts to determine how those qualities may be strengthened and enhanced for the greater good of the overall institution and its several campuses and specialized programs.
- 3. The stubborn fiscal problems of Southampton College, which have persisted for nearly four decades, must be resolved and that campus must become financially self-sustaining while maintaining and improving the quality of its academic programs and student services. The College community is deeply engaged in a collegial initiative with the Board of Trustees and central administration to transform its curriculum, improve its facilities and achieve its full potential.
- 4. The University's myriad administrative processes and practices must be reviewed against "best practice" standards; its legacy information systems must be modernized, upgraded, and integrated; and access to information must be expanded. The University is currently in the process of selecting an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system and planning for its implementation.
- 5. The institution's administrative structures and matrix approach to organizational leadership has proven effective in balancing the tensions between the central administration and the several campuses, but it is not sufficiently understood across the University. The administration is seeking to address this issue through improved communications and dialogue.
- 6. The University faculty governance system in effect from 1991 through 2001 was not effective, but the new system implemented by the Board has not been accepted by the faculty at some campuses. The Chair of the Board's Academic Affairs Committee and the Vice President for Academic Affairs are working with faculty leaders to create a system that will be effective and more broadly acceptable.
- 7. <u>Strategic Planning (especially Academic Planning) and Outcomes Assessment are not yet sufficiently developed and integrated</u>. The central administration will work with the campuses to build upon the foundations that have been created to construct and implement a more cohesive University-wide system.
- 8. The use of Adjunct faculty must be reduced and governed more consistently by academic considerations. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and Deans are developing new, two-year course planning schedules to maximize teaching and student contact by full-time faculty members at the residential and regional campuses.

Long Island University is committed to continuing its service to higher education and looks forward to providing even greater educational opportunities to its students in the future. It acknowledges the work that remains to be done, accepts the challenges that have been identified, and is excited about what Long Island University will achieve in the years ahead.