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ABSTRACT

A Study of the Impact of Mission on Selected Aspects of College Administration
(February 1980)

Jeanne Brockmann, B.A., Beaver College
Ed.D., University of Massachusetts
Directed by: Professor William Lauroesch

The purpose of this research was to examine, in a historical context, selected aspects of administrative practice at Empire State College. The College was created by the State University of New York in 1970-71 as a response on behalf of the University in its effort to meet the special educational needs of students in New York State who were unable or unwilling to attend other University colleges.

The context of the study consists of the early years of the College's existence, from origin to the time of accreditation. Selected aspects of administering the new College are reviewed in this paper: Learning Center organization and operation, admissions and enrollment, academic record keeping, and personnel and staffing.

A case study was developed through a review of the College files and institutional research findings;
interviews with the College President, who had been a
member of the original planning task force, and the Chan-
cellar of the State University of New York who first pro-
posed the idea for an alternative college within the State
University of New York system; and through a review of
selected materials on American higher education today,
including materials of other institutions serving the
new student.

Special attention has been given to examining whether
or not a viable and visable alternative college could be
established within the State University of New York system,
and whether or net the College would serve students not
already attending post-secondary institutions. Guiding
questions for the research included:

1. Why were each of the areas studied important?
2. How did Empire State College handle the designated
   areas? What was their rationale for doing it that way?
3. What happened, or how did procedures change
during the period under investigation?
4. What were the results of the effort? In light of
   the goals of reaching new students and creating
   another academic institution, what worked and
   what didn't work?
After a four year period, the institution was open, accredited, and flourishing. At a time of declining enrollments at many other institutions, Empire State College's backlog of applicants continued to grow. At a time of curtailing budgets, the College's continued to increase. Students' educational needs were being met. Alternate ways of delivering higher education in New York State were proving viable. The targeted populations were enrolled.

Finally, and most important for the purposes of this study, effective administrative practice in the four areas under review had evolved.

The researcher concluded that success in establishing a college pursuing a mission such as that prescribed by the planners of Empire State College is dependent on three conditions:

1. There has to be a large measure of freedom from systemic constraint;
2. Decision makers must be capable of proceeding on the basis of intuitive judgments, yet self-critical and resolute enough to change course whenever necessary;
3. The entire staff must possess the energy and commitment to undergo continuous modification of administrative practice.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Empire State College, the newest four year undergraduate college in the State University of New York, is the first non-traditional public college to receive its accreditation from the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Founded in 1971, the College was to develop, deliver, and test alternative ways of bringing higher education to new, growing, diverse, and potential student populations in New York State.

In February 1971, the State University of New York presented its plan for a new State University College to a group of educators. The plans for the proposed college were endorsed and foundation grants were obtained to finance the planning stages. Two months later, the Governor authorized the establishment of Empire State College and its first administrative staff was appointed. Four years later, just after the College received its accreditation, there were approximately 4,000 students studying in over thirty locations throughout the state.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine, historically, certain aspects of Empire State College's administrative
development from its original conception to its accreditation. Could a non-traditional educational institution be established within a public megauniversity and retain its own identity? Would the new institution reach "new" students? The selected areas for study are: Learning Center organization and operation, admissions and enrollment, academic record keeping, and personnel and staffing.

**Research Questions**

The examination was made within the framework of several points of enquiry:

1. Why were each of the areas studied important?
2. How did Empire State College handle the designated areas? What was their rationale for doing it that way?
3. What happened, or how did procedures change during the period under investigation?
4. What were the results of the effort? In light of the goals of reaching new students and creating another viable academic institution, what worked and what didn't work?

**Definition of Terms**

As College staff developed the academic programs, some familiar terms have taken on specialized meaning. Some of these terms are defined here to clarify their meaning
as used in this study.

1. **Adjunct Faculty**: part-time faculty member with special skills needed by the College.

2. **Assessment of Prior Learning**: the process by which the student's previous formal and informal educational experience is examined and judged for credit; how much additional learning is needed and in what areas.

3. **College-wide Program**: an organizational group within the College; the grouping consists of multiple small learning outposts with one or two faculty members in each site (or Learning Unit).

4. **Coordinating Center**: headquarters for the College housing the main administrative staff and the centralized administrative offices, e.g., admissions, financial aid, student accounts, business affairs, printing, supplies, mail.

5. **Coordinator**: the academic head for a small Learning Unit within the College-wide Program.

6. **Dean**: the academic and administrative head for a Learning Center.

7. **Degree Program**: a comprehensive statement of the content and mix of the learning for which the College will grant its degree; an individual program drawn up by a student and mentor.
8. **Enrolled Student**: a student who has attended an orientation workshop, signed an enrollment form, and started studying.

9. **Learning Center** (sometimes referred to as Regional Learning Center): a learning site with a core faculty with experience in major academic areas.

10. **Learning Contract**: a specific study plan, signed by the student and mentor, which extends over a determined length of time and covering a particular aspect of a student's Degree Program; contracts describe the particular study to achieve the student's stated goals, the topics, the resources to be used, what the student is to accomplish, how long it will take, how much credit is to be granted if the contract is successfully completed, how and on what basis the work will be evaluated.

11. **Learning Unit**: mini Learning Centers, with one or two faculty at each Unit.

12. **Mentor**: full-time faculty member of the College who works with students in designing their degree programs and learning contracts, evaluates the learning which took place, counsels in academic matters, provides academic instruction, and marshalls appropriate learning resources.
13. **Non-traditional:** learning without classrooms, laboratories, residence halls, dining and recreational facilities, and other aspects of campus life; directed independent study.

14. **Orientation Workshop:** periodic workshops for admissible students and held at all College locations to introduce students to the College's instructional methods and faculty; students generally enroll and begin their study after attending a workshop.

15. **Professional Staff:** members of the staff whose primary responsibility to the College is administrative; basically, non-teaching staff.

16. **Special Purpose Programs:** programs with a special academic focus, e.g., Religion in the City; may or may not be funded with external monies.

17. **Staff:** the College's combined staff—teaching, non-teaching, and support personnel.

18. **Support Staff:** technical, clerical and secretarial staff members whose work support the academic program and its administrative support functions.

19. **Tutor:** a person with particular skills needed on a part-time basis for a short period of time.
Delimitations of the Study

This study will deal with selected aspects of administering Empire State College. It will not attempt to evaluate the academic program, determine attrition rates, examine the types of external learning resources used, evaluate staff performance, critique the governance setup, or scrutinize the program at the College's Center for Labor Studies. These areas are left for others to study.

Basic Assumptions

The study is designed around three basic assumptions of the planners:

1. There was a need for the State University of New York to create a special college to develop and test new approaches to learning;

2. That this need could be accommodated within existing State University's procedures while retaining the College's own institutional mission and character;

3. That Empire State College would serve different segments of the population heretofore not interested in or able to attend courses in existing SUNY colleges.
Need for the Study

Empire State College is the country's only public, Statewide, non-traditional college. It was established in 1971. The staff, nor others, have yet produced a document which draws together administrative aspects of the College's basic developmental period. Though this study treats only selected administrative areas, it is hoped that the treatise will serve as a partial historical record of these important beginning years in the life of the College.

A Review of Related Literature

Various literature was reviewed on the status of U.S. higher education today, and on several other non-traditional colleges: Hampshire College, Goddard College, Minnesota Metropolitan College, Community College of Vermont, and Great Britain's Open University. None of these institutions is truly comparable to Empire State College. Some have campuses and classrooms; they serve differing constituencies and sized geographic areas; they reach the individual student in varying ways. The interests and efforts of various states and countries were also discussed with representatives of such bodies as they visited Empire State to learn more about its concept and operation. These visits also included opportunities for Empire State staff members to enquire further into the
literature and/or plans underway at the visitor's institution.

The files of the State University of New York and Empire State College have been examined, as have the extensive Empire State College research findings. Interviews were conducted with the State University of New York Chancellor, Empire State College's President and members of his staff. Where relevant, information gained from the literature has been included in this study.

**Research Methods Used**

A historical case study approach to the topic was selected because no such document existed.* Also, it was hoped that during the process of examination and analysis the researcher would gain a perspective helpful to the College as it continued its developmental growth.

Discussions took place with various members of the University of Massachusetts faculty and with the Empire State College and State University of New York administrations before a prospectus for the study was developed. The researcher then continued the review of current literature on identified institutions and on higher education in the United States today. Interview questions were

---

*The researcher felt that the case study approach would facilitate the use of the study by others interested in similar types of programs.
developed, meetings were arranged and carried out on schedule. Findings were recorded and incorporated into the manuscript.

Chapter II sets forth the environment in which the State University of New York examined the feasibility for creating another college within the existing system. Causes of unrest during the 1950s and 1960s, their manifestations and implications, jarred SUNY into responsive action. What assumptions did SUNY make about its role in the next decade? How would it respond?

Chapter III describes several parts of that response, the creation of a new college within the University system--Empire State College. The administrative structure of the College is explained, with rationale given as to why it was so established and what changed during the period of examination. The selected areas for close examination include: academic record keeping, admissions and enrollment, personnel and staffing, and Regional Learning Center planning and coordination.

Chapter IV summarizes results of the effort as they related to the specific goals of establishing a viable extended institution and of reaching "new" students.
CHAPTER II
LESSONS OF THE SIXTIES: NEEDS FOR THE SEVENTIES

In the 1950s, higher education enjoyed a golden age of unprecedented growth, an affluence not previously experienced, and an exalted status in the public mind. (Pifer, 1975, p.3)* During the 1960s, this dramatic growth continued, and SUNY is one example of such unusual developments in higher education. "Growth" was often projected, though, in terms of increased enrollments; the number of graduates an institution had; the number and size of expanded campus facilities; numbers of curricular offerings; or dollar support received. Human aspects of learning were often overlooked and, consequently, campus unrest erupted toward the end of that decade. Students, supported in some cases by faculty, clamored for changes which would make their educational experience more "relevant."

Cries were frequently heard that universities were warmongering, that there was need for a relevant curriculum, that there was a need for full participation in the governance system, that facilities were inadequate, that

*Reference List and Notes are located at the conclusion of the text, beginning on page 10
arbitrary authoritarian behavior by administrators had to cease, that a generation gap existed--that the universities were run by outdated people, systems, procedures, and management, and that adults were incapable of listening dispassionately or to criticize rationally what the young were saying.

Other cries, quieter ones, spoke of our affluent society which had bred this generation of bored youth. They noticed that students sought, perhaps unwittingly, sustained adolescence. Some of the older generation felt discrepancies existed between the students' professed principles and their application of the insistence that change had to occur on their terms and timetables.

Samul B. Gould, former Chancellor of the State University of New York, described the times in his book, *Today's Academic Condition*.

The academic condition is being altered radically because the world is being altered radically. We can no longer consider the university as an enterprise largely removed from the main concerns of society, but now must see it as a crucial part of the web of major social institutions, each part of which is rapidly and perceptibly changing in character and direction, while at the same time interacting with all the others. . . . Events no longer permit colleges and universities to stand aloof
without being called to constant account (Gould, 1970, p.3)

**Causes of Unrest, their Manifestations and Implications**

Causes of campus unrest have repeatedly been traced to alienation from traditional values and practices; sudden bulging enrollments; inadequate facilities, financing, and planning; the slowness in which the academy changes; and the quality or high level of impersonalness prevalent in society at that time.

Manifestations of the need for change were numerous and widespread. Some students were on strike, some were participating in riots, and some were studying. Enrollments began to fall, as did fiscal support levels. Unionism among faculty increased, as an anti-establishment atmosphere prevailed. The number of traditionally aged college students began to decline. As the Vietnam war and the draft ended, older and more mature students began enrolling, bringing with them different experiences, educational values, and needs. Further, the job market was softening and the need for academic credentials was heightened; a degree offered a ticket to economic opportunity. Interest in vocational education arose, along with greater interest in social concerns.
Testing the academy. The university was being "tested" in several areas as the decade of the Seventies emerged:

1. Could universities cease "talking democracy" and practice it? It was clear that they could not remain passive any longer.

2. Higher education had to play its responsibility in helping to unify the levels of education, especially as interest in life-long educational opportunities expanded.

3. The financing of higher education had to be clarified. Compatible commitments must be obtained from all segments of the university community, from all governmental levels, and elsewhere.

4. The university must redefine its commitment to intellectualism and social concerns.

5. The nature of political protest had to be changed. Was it possible to turn those efforts around to support the university in its "search for intellectual power and helping it to return to a more humanistic learning process"? (Gould, 1970, p.17)

6. As larger number of faculty members joined unions, would the close relationship to their roles in intellectual pursuit clash head-on with those of trade unionism? What would happen to collegiality?
7. How could intellectual standards be maintained when there were severe pressures to introduce new courses and instructional methods, as well as to admit students regardless of their academic preparation?

8. To what degree could the university change without being weakened or destroyed? What would be the effects of "participatory democracy"? How would meaningful participation be defined?

9. A better understanding must be created among members of the university community regarding the institution's nature, purposes, and motives.

As Gould (1970, p. 54) concluded, "The university is confronted but not confounded."

Overtones. Implications of this need for change were far-reaching. Given the beginning appearance of new curricular areas and instructional modes, and given the situation of leveling enrollments, an oversupply of teachers existed in some areas. Tenure provisions and the appearance of the "steady state" made it difficult for institutions to make changes. Faculty held on to their jobs. Added physical plants had to be maintained. Behavioral modes had to be re-examined. The "outdated" people, systems and practices had to be recast. Governance systems had to be revamped.
Responses. Institutions began responding to these pressures by taking several courses of action, immediate in some areas and planned in others.

Institutional objectives and missions were reviewed and amended. Curriculum content reflected social concerns as new courses were added. Alternate approaches to teaching and learning were tried, revised, and adopted. External learning resources were utilized, with a broader acceptance of the notion that valid learning could take place outside of the classroom. Structural changes were instituted. Wider use of technology was being initiated. Interinstitutional cooperative efforts emerged, and consortia arrangements were expanding in number. Policies and programs were changed to accommodate women and minority students. With a heightened need for accountability to benefactors, greater attention was paid to cost-effective management, operation, and reporting. There was even movement toward participatory democratic governance.¹

¹A variety of non-traditional institutions and experiential programs were developing in the sixties, although this study will not cover that variety. Rather it will center in depth on a single institution. Reviews and descriptions of other innovating colleges and universities may be found in such sources as: Benson and Hodgkinson, 1974; Berte, 1972; Carnegie Commission, 1970, 1971; Commission on Non-traditional Study, 1973; Dressel, 1971; Gould and Cross, 1972; Grant and Riesman, 1978; Hall, 1974; Heiss, 1975; Hodgkinson, 1971; Houle, 1973; Milton, 1972; Stickler, 1964; Valley, 1972.
The State University of New York followed suit. It undertook to set forth its own concerns and accelerate its long-range program to accommodate the anticipated changes in growth of enrollment, structure, and academic programs throughout the SUNY system.

Provisions of SUNY 1968 Master Plan called for many changes, only a few of which will be mentioned here. There was to be more representative participation in University governance. An expanded in-service training program was to be initiated. Campuses were to clearly define and widely disseminate their goals, information about their admission patterns, and their policies. Students wishing to transfer from one SUNY institution to another were to be guaranteed such transfers. Continued and expanded efforts were to be made in exploring the feasibility of utilizing computers and other technological advancements in instruction and in the administration of the University system's institutions. Additional opportunities were to be created for easy access to the University. Cooperative arrangements with other public and private academic institutions were to be expanded, as they were to be with industrial concerns and cultural organizations here and abroad.

The educational needs and interests of the citizens of New York State were to be restudied and additional support given to existing efforts to serve non-traditional
students. Encouragement was to be given to the development of additional inter-disciplinary programs in teaching and research, especially those oriented to changing human values and behavior. And, maximum participation by faculty, students, and staff was to be assured as the identification of needed changes and the designing of appropriate answers to those needs took place. (Note 51)

**SUNY Assumptions for the Seventies**

Basic SUNY assumptions for the decade were set forth by the Chancellor, Ernest L. Boyer. The University would be composed of a Statewide network of inter-related and coordinated institutions. Students would have diversified interests and needs. Academic programs, therefore, would be more varied, reflecting new areas of knowledge, social expectations, and student needs. Patterns of study would be flexible to accommodate these new efforts. External relationships with educational and other enterprises would be strengthened. Mindful of the increasing need to be held accountable, communication efforts coupled with effective planning and management practices would be extended. (Note 51, p.3)

**How to Proceed?**

Discussion ensued about the viability of creating another unit in the SUNY system to facilitate the implementation of the University's goals for the Seventies.
Several considerations were made by the Board of Trustees, Chancellor, and staff prior to making the final decision to create another college within the State University system.

Considerations. These considerations were articulated by the Chancellor when he announced the formation of the new college and during subsequent conversations with him and members of his staff.

1. A communications and data processing revolution was underway in the U.S. More people were in touch with each other more rapidly and in more varied ways than ever before.

2. A more highly developed transportation industry had provided us with opportunities to travel farther, faster, and more conveniently. We were becoming a mobile society.

3. We were observing dramatic shifts in human and social development. Teenagers were maturing faster than their parents and absorbing knowledge more rapidly.

4. More and more people were wanting to return to college later in life, to earn credentials, and to further their knowledge.

5. Institutions of higher education the world over were beginning to re-examine their traditional
assumptions about who should go to college and what the length and nature of a college experience should be.

6. The SUNY Board of Trustees could create new, freestanding colleges and had done so. The University offered an existing structure within which to establish a new, flexible college which would be unencumbered with existing terminology, methods, structure, and ideas. A fresh start was needed.

7. The University's new Chancellor wanted to affirm that SUNY was serious about being in the business of education and that SUNY was capable, responsive, and responsible. It would take a long time for faculty and administrators at an existing institution to plan and carry out a more flexible institutionalized pattern of education.

8. Existing SUNY institutions were already spread widely throughout the State. They provided a broad range of academic offerings at all levels of higher education. (Note 48)

9. Though SUNY and New York State enrollments were actually burgeoning in the fall of 1970, SUNY wanted to find other kinds of educational opportunities for those wanting alternate approaches to higher education.
10. There existed enormous SUNY budgets for buildings and ways had to be found to begin to reduce such capital costs.

11. There was visible support from the Governor and Legislature for a new and different kind of college. (Note 30)

**Actions taken.** In the fall of 1970, the Chancellor appointed a task force to determine how the University could best meet the needs of current higher education in New York State. Earlier educational patterns which had been imported from Europe and applied to American institutions of higher learning would no longer suffice. (Note 39, p.18) The planning task force, which consisted of SUNY Central Administration staff members, began to draw up a design for a new University College. (Appendix A lists members of the task force.) Members visited the Open University in Great Britain and became familiar with that institutional effort, its plans and experiences. Consultants were also called in to critique the emerging SUNY plans. (Consultants are noted in Appendix B.)

At the same time, continuing conversations with several foundation representatives matured, conversations about the need for explicit and visible ways to break open higher education's customary approach to learning and
to find effective ways to offer post-secondary education to new student populations. The State University of New York offered an appropriate climate in which to establish such opportunities for the citizens of New York State.

In January 1971, the Chancellor described to the Board of Trustees the directions and impact of the re-examination being undertaken by the task force:

Every basic assumption on which we've built in the past is being sharply challenged. We are re-examining such fundamental questions as who should go to college, what and where and how students should study—and for how long?

With rising aspirations and the impact of the communications and transportation revolution, we now see the need for institutions that are more open, more imaginative, more versatile, and more flexible, both in their structure and their style. Further, we now have the capacity to develop such institutions. We are now beginning to understand that the university of tomorrow will be more like a public library than a private club, and that tomorrow's campus will not be a 'place of confinement' but a 'point of departure,' a 'place of renewal,' a 'staging ground' for learning.

We must now develop a higher learning system that is not restricted to a rigid curriculum, a single campus or a fixed calendar. The new system must be geared to a pattern of offerings which permits each student to study what he wants, when he wants it, and at a place convenient to him.

Such a revolutionary view of the university is clearly possible. What is needed now is the bold action of a major institution which has the resources, the determination, the visibility, and the capacity to link these into a design which will bring into being the university of tomorrow. (Note 39, pp. 18-19)

At the same Board meeting, the Trustees accepted the Chancellor's recommendation to create a new college. The
Board resolved not only to establish this kind of non-residential degree-granting college within the University, but they also directed the Chancellor to explore all of the steps necessary to implement this resolution on or before September 1, 1971. (Note 39, p. 19)

The task force report was submitted to the Chancellor eleven days later. The report, *A Prospectus for a New University College*, became the blueprint for the new SUNY college, later entitled Empire State College, aspects of which are the prime focus of this study.
CHAPTER III

EMPIRE STATE COLLEGE: A SUNY RESPONSE

The State University of New York

SUNY, established by the State Legislature in 1948, is the youngest of this country's state universities. The University has grown from 29 State supported but unaffiliated campuses in 1948 to the largest coordinated, centrally administered multi-level system of public higher education in the United States. Other than City University of New York's senior colleges, the State University includes all public institutions of higher education in New York State.

In 1971, the State University of New York was a network of 71 academic institutions consisting of university centers, four-year colleges of arts and science, two-year colleges of agriculture and technology, medical centers, statutory colleges, community colleges, and educational opportunity centers. (A list of SUNY campuses in noted in Appendix C.) The State University's academic program covered virtually all areas of general and professional education.

As noted, the State University of New York was concerned about the condition of higher education.
especially in New York State. Staff members were busy in late 1970 examining appropriate ways for the University to begin answering new, expressed educational needs of the citizens of New York State. The Chancellor's main thrust in this area was the creation of Empire State College as part of the megauniversity, SUNY.

This section of the paper will speak to the nature of the proposed college and its growth. Though there are numerous aspects of administration which could be treated here, four have been selected to show evidence of ways the State University of New York was to serve new students in a viable, yet visible, new college within the SUNY system.

This expansive network of various types of institutions had not yet, in 1970, offered the citizens in New York State the range of educational offerings envisioned by the Chancellor. Educational opportunities had to be more available for a student different from the 18-22 aged student who resided on a campus. Additional experimentation, testing, and delivery of academic programs were needed for this different student who would play a significant role in defining his own educational goals. Learning had to be available to the student whenever and wherever he was able to take advantage of the opportunity.

The Chancellor felt it better to establish another institution to concentrate on these needs, rather than to
attempt to introduce such innovations throughout the system as a whole.

**Overview of Empire State College**

The new college, Empire State College, was the 72nd college established within SUNY. It was established as a separate, visible effort on SUNY's part to take alternate paths in higher education to the citizens of New York State and to build upon the lessons learned from the Sixties.

**Mission.** The College's special mission manifests this conviction on the part of SUNY:

1. To serve new students;
2. To develop, deliver, and test alternate modes of instruction;
3. To explore and evaluate non-classroom learning; and
4. To experiment with new approaches to delivering educational services, within varying time frames, in a cost-effective manner.

**New Students.** Students to be served by the new college would be those motivated to learn independently, those unable to or unwilling to participate in existing study programs at other institutions. The age span for these students would be wide. Students would come from a wide range of economic, social, and intellectual
backgrounds. (Note 50, p. 9)

The specific students who were to be served included:

(21, 10)

1. Those who wish more flexibility in their educational environment and modes of learning;

2. Those who wish to remain at home or who are housebound and who wish to continue studying for personal or other reasons;

3. Older, mature individuals who wish to pursue a degree, or who have individual educational objectives;

4. Those in employment who wish to pursue education part time for career objectives;

5. Selected secondary students (dropouts with promise, the unfocused student with high innate capacity, the accelerated student who is capable of carrying high school and introductory higher education level work). (Note 50)

**Academic program.** Mindful of the specifics spelled out in the College's mission, the academic program was to be sufficiently diverse and comprehensive to meet the educational goals of those students. The students were to be an integral part of the design of each individual's study program. The program would include the old and the new, i.e., most traditional academic disciplines, interdisciplinary programs,
and special programs to be developed with industry and social agencies. (Note 50, p.14)

Study programs were to be segmented into individual learning contracts developed by the student and mentor. Contracts would spell out the nature of the study to be undertaken, the specific time frame in which the work was to be accomplished, and the basis for the evaluation for the work. A series of contracts would constitute the program of study, or degree program, resulting in the awarding of an associate or baccalaureate degree.

Learning resources. Varied learning resources would be utilized in the learning process:

1. Independent study programs or courses, with or without tutorial assistance;
2. Correspondence programs;
3. Campus residence programs or workshops;
4. Credit by examinations;
5. International study;
6. Experiential credit: community service, museum work, etc.;
7. Educational communications and other technological processes: computer assisted instruction, TV, radio, cassettes, informational relay and retrieval systems;
8. Management training programs: in-service or field programs;
9. Learning modules. (Note 50)

Organization. In order to carry out the designated mission, the new college was to be created administratively separate from the SUNY Central Administration or any existing campus, enabling the college to develop its academic program with its own integrity and clarity. Therefore, the proposed college would need its own administrative structure to support the students and academic program envisioned.

The Original Administrative Structure

The College would have its own administrative and academic staff, unique student body, College Council, advisory groups, governance structure, curriculum, and teaching methods. It would have no academic departments, marks, or letter grades. Credit would be granted in terms of months of credit, not semester credit hours. The College would operate on a 12 month calendar. Students were to be admitted at any time throughout the year.

The College would have no campus of its own. It would not be reliant on construction schedules or on the ability to raise funds to support a building program with its necessary attendant maintenance, security system, and bonding schedules.
The College's administrative headquarters would be centrally located in the State with Regional Learning Centers located throughout the State in easy commuting distance for students.

The coordinating or administrative center. Rather than establish a network of academic and administrative centers throughout the State, the President decided that there would be a central administrative center, a coordinating center. It would house the College's executive, administrative, and support staffs. Additional support staff would be hired for the Regional Learning Centers. The Coordinating Center would also supply the administrative services necessary to support the academic program: admissions counseling, academic record keeping, finance and management, personnel, media consultation, studio operation, research, editing and publishing, printing and distribution, program design, Regional Learning Center planning and coordination, program evaluation, and credentialing. In essence, the administrative staff was to be responsible for the general management of the College, for charting new directions, and for evaluating the students' study programs and the institution's overall effectiveness.

(Note 59, p.29)
The Coordinating Center was to be located outside the city of Albany. Albany was already replete with educational institutions: no further confusion was needed. The Center was to be easily accessible to facilitate later meetings and to expedite the delivery of services and goods across the State. (Boyer interview)

Inasmuch as the College was to make use of relatively modest quarters, members of the SUNY Central Administration's staff sought low cost space nearby, space which would be quickly available for occupancy. The former library building of Skidmore College in Saratoga Springs answered that need and was leased, somewhat refurbished, and the core planning staff moved there in the matter of two months.

Not being certain about the amount of available State fiscal support, the numbers of students who would actually enroll, and what the most effective learning situation would be for those students, several staffing patterns were set forth for varying sized student bodies. The SUNY planning group decided that for the initial year of operation five hundred students would be enrolled. This decision was made, given the fact that there was limited planning time and money, and that a sense of collegiality had to be established among the faculty. (Note 29) With this plan, it was proposed to have the Coordinating Center and two Learning Centers operative by the end of the first
year. Each Learning Center would have 250 FTEs (full-time equivalents) by the end of the first year of operation and gradually build to a maximum size of 400 FTEs. (Note 50, p.12)

Initially, the Coordinating Center would have seven professional staff members: the President, an Assistant to the President for legal matters, a Vice-President, two academic support staff members, and two administrative support staff members. Supportive clerical and technical staff would number 23; six in the academic program area and 17 on the administrative support area. (Note 50, p.32) The College would not have academic departments in the traditional manner. The President determined that functions, not titles, were important and that adequate staffing had to be available to serve the special needs of this unusually structured SUNY College. (Note 29)

The College's executive personnel group was to consist of the President, Vice-Presidents, and any other officers that were to be appointed.

The President would be responsible for overall continuing operations, legal affairs, and external relations as they related to the College's mission and as they were within the SUNY Board of Trustees' policies and the Regents' regulations. (Note 50, p. 29)
The Vice-President for Academic Affairs would be responsible for the quality and design of the comprehensive academic program: Learning Center planning and operation, the evaluation of learning taking place, admissions, academic records, personnel, curriculum development (the research and evaluation of academic quality and curricular areas), and media development.

A Vice-President for Administration would eventually be hired and be responsible for the business management and general administrative matters throughout the College, including all productive services and the delivery of library, informational and instructional materials. Until that time, the President would carry this responsibility, sharing the detail with a Director of Business Affairs. (The original chart is presented in Appendix D.)

All staff members (academic, administrative, and supportive) would be regular employees of SUNY; all were to be hired in accordance with SUNY policies and practices. The academic staff would be entitled to tenure or continuing appointment and the administrative staff to term and permanent appointments. Clerical and some technical staff members would be part of the New York State Civil Service. Supplementary staff members could be hired with monies generated through research grants.
All staff members, including the academic, would be on 12 month contracts to accommodate the Empire State College calendar. They would enjoy all regular SUNY benefits. Salaries for the full-time academic staff were to be adjusted upward from the usual SUNY faculty salary scales in compensation for the 12 month work schedule.

Faculty members, though regular faculty members of SUNY, would be given academic rank for budgetary purposes only. Their functional title would be Mentor, reflecting the nature of their working relationship with the students and with the College's special teaching modes.

As part of SUNY, Empire State College was to have tuition rates the same as those at other SUNY units or campuses. However, these costs would be prorated for Empire State students, reflecting the nature of their academic endeavors: the length of time under contract, whether or not the study level was upper or lower division, and if the student was studying on a full-or part-time basis.

The College was to establish academic and administrative relationships with other institutions: to share faculty, libraries, office and recreational areas; to allow students to cross-register to other public and private institutions for class or laboratory work; to utilize faculty and staff in teaching, advisory, or consulting situations. Such practices would accomplish several aims:
help keep down rental costs; afford students a larger variety of learning resources, methods, and faculty; utilize existing space elsewhere which was not being used to capacity; provide a means for students to share the learning gained through their independent study; and build a broader range of support based on first-hand knowledge about the College and its learning programs.

The Regional Learning Centers. The Regional Learning Centers were to provide the locus of instruction and the facilities for advisement, counseling, and tutoring. Centers would also provide the communication link to admissions, records, and to the testing services of the Coordinating Center.

Faculty and students would meet at mutually convenient times and locations, including evenings and weekends. The academic program was to be responsive to student needs. It would involve the student in its design and would utilize diverse learning resources existing in many locations and forms. Other resources were to be designed or prepared. (Note 50, p. 23)

The Regional Learning Centers were to be ultimately located within reasonable commuting distance of every resident of the State. The plan was to open two Centers during the first year of operation and to build to a
Statewide network as quickly as resources were provided and as there was sufficient student demand. (Note 50, p. 27)

Each Center's facilities would include staff and faculty offices, an information center, a duplication and mail room, lounge and waiting room, and other space for equipment needed to utilize learning materials in the various media forms. (Note 50, p. 28)

The two Learning Centers would each have a Dean or Director, a professional staff member to support the academic program (counseling, testing, etc.), two full-time Mentors, and 20 part-time study tutors (to equal five full-time Mentors). The non-academic staff would number five clerical persons to handle all the administrative details involved in supporting the Regional Learning Center students and academic staff. (Appendix E)

The College opens. In August 1971, the core planning staff moved from office space in the SUNY Central Administration facilities in Albany to Saratoga Springs and opened the Coordinating Center. The staff began developing and approving preliminary academic policies, procedures, and structure. Faculty and additional administrative staff were to be hired. Student recruitment and admissions procedures were being further refined and adopted.
A month later, the first Regional Learning Centers opened in New York City and Albany. A Dean and two Mentors began working with a handful of students in each Center. The College also entered into a contract with the New York State School for Industrial and Labor Relations for faculty members to teach labor-related subjects to Empire State College students, thus creating a labor studies unit within the College.

In September of 1971, then, Empire State College was established, open, and operating--seven months after SUNY's Board of Trustees approved the Chancellor's request to create a new University College.

The Developing College

Events that took place in New York State, the State University of New York, and at Empire State College between the time when the first students were admitted in September 1971 and the time when accreditation was received from the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in December 1974 impinged on the orderly development of the College.

Fall 1971. In the early days of fall 1971, the State imposed a budget freeze on the University and all of its Colleges. The freeze prohibited hiring faculty and other personnel; it curbed travel, rental money, and all other
expenditures. Empire State had to request exemptions to these budgetary restrictions in order to develop the infant institution and its academic program. Some expenditure exemption requests were honored and progress continued, though at somewhat slower pace than originally anticipated.

Fall 1974. Nevertheless, at the end of 1974, SUNY had approved Empire State's academic program, approval from the State Education Department was pending, and accreditation by Middle States was granted. State appropriations had grown to $4,700,000. Almost 3,000 students were enrolled, representing an FTE figure of 2,700. Over 800 degrees had been awarded. The staff size had grown to 193 full-time persons, 66 percent of which were teaching faculty. The College was operating in 22 locations through its network of five Regional Learning Centers, smaller Learning Units, and Special Programs. (Appendix F) (Note 37)

An ESC governance structure was in place and the College was also represented within the SUNY governance structure. The Empire State College Council was overseeing the College's operation, groups representing specialized interest and program areas were advising the President, and local advisory groups were also working closely with the Regional Learning Centers. The College had in place its own Assembly, elected Senate and Standing Committees,
Constitution and Bylaws. How did all of this happen in a short time span of just over three years?

Summary. The original functions of the Coordinating Center were to supply administrative services necessary to support the academic program and to house the College's executive, administrative, and basic support staff.

Though there were multiple aspects of carrying out these functions, this study will review four of them: academic record keeping, admissions and enrollment, personnel and staffing, and Regional Learning Center operation.
CHAPTER IV
ADMINISTERING EMPIRE STATE COLLEGE:
A SELECTIVE INQUIRY

Introduction

There are multiple aspects of administration which are designed to support academic programs. An academic institution created to serve non-traditional students, and one to serve them with new or different teaching methods, would need other-than-usual supportive administrative service systems. At Empire State College, what were these systems? How were they different from those in conventional institutions? What kind of administrative structure and systems would support this unique educational program?

Multiple kinds of structures and support systems might have been designed. For example, the new attempt being made by the State University of New York could have been attached to an existing SUNY College. The new College could have been set up along usual academic departmental lines; it could have used varied, little tried learning methods on regular aged college undergraduates; it could have operated from only one geographic location; its academic calendar could have been segmented into semesters or quarters; evaluated learning could have been recognized
in terms of letter or numerical grades; degree program requirements could have been classified along existing State University and State Education Department guidelines; tuition and fee rates, different from those at existing units within the University, could have been established; a specialized resource library could have been constructed, along with living and recreational facilities; specialized counselor services could have been inaugurated; and so on. The list of "what could have been" is lengthy.

The overall structure for Empire State College as designed by the staff of the State University was set forth in Chapter II. Therefore, this chapter will examine four of the administrative areas which supported the organizational structure and academic program of that College:

1. Learning Center planning and operation
2. Admissions and enrollment
3. Academic record keeping
4. Personnel and staffing.

Each of these areas is to be examined with an eye as to what the perceived need was, how could it be best served, how it was served, how it differed from customary practice, and what lessons were learned . . . particularly lessons which might be of interest to others who are instituting their own variation to traditionally organized academic programs.
Learning Center Organization and Operation

Conventional four-year colleges are located in a campus setting. The overall program and its administration are the ultimate responsibility of a President. The academic program is the immediate responsibility of a Vice-President for Academic Affairs, a Provost, or Dean; and the administrative operation is the responsibility of a Vice-President for Administration. Titles and structure vary, often according to institutional preference, size, mission, and practicality.

The academic program is generally separated into departments or schools, according to academic areas, e.g., elementary education, mathematics, political science, natural sciences. There might be separate departments or administrative groupings for special programs, such as a continuing education program or an evening school. Departments are often headed by an elected or appointed Chairman or Dean.

The nature of the non-academic organization also varies from college to college. Generally, there are separate offices for designated functions: business affairs, external relations, admissions, financial aid, student records, student services, library, auxiliary services, maintenance or plant operation, and fiscal management.

The structure of a college may depend on the size of
the student body and hence the faculty, the breadth and nature of its academic program, the amount and kind of fiscal resources available, and to some degree, the decision of its head or institutional preferences. The longevity and stated mission of the institution could also be determinants.

Organization. There are three major reasons why Empire State College's organizational pattern would be different from those generally in existence at other colleges: the College was to be a non-residential one without academic buildings, recreational facilities, and the like; because there would be no large concentrations of students at the Centers or Units at any given time, and because the academic program was to be taken to the students. SUNY was a public supported institution, and the Chancellor wanted its citizens to use the University. Therefore, one of his aims was that every citizen in New York State who wanted to continue his higher education, and who was qualified to do so, was to be within reasonable commuting distance of some SUNY facility. (Note 50, p. 23)

Without classrooms, libraries, laboratories, living and recreational facilities, there was no need for financing and maintaining buildings, parking lots, and other kinds of campus facilities. Departments and schools were not needed
at Empire State either. Faculty would have broad academic responsibilities; they would be teaching in their disciplines, as well as in others most familiar to them. Large amounts of office or meeting space would not be needed, because there would be no large concentration of students at any one Center at any one time. Mentors were to meet with their students individually, at any mutually convenient time and location.

Original plans for Empire State College called for a central administrative center (the Coordinating Center) and varying sized Learning Centers dispersed throughout the State in order to reach students not now attending SUNY colleges. The Coordinating Center would have a component of full-time faculty members to develop learning resources for the Centers, in addition to a non-academic professional and support staff. Learning Centers would have an academic-administrative head, a few full-time faculty members, and several tutors. Smaller educational groupings, called Learning Units, would be outreaching arms of the Centers. Units would have one or two full-time faculty members and an undetermined number of tutors. The number of tutors depended upon the size student body, and whether or not their academic areas related to those of the faculty members. If they were not related, tutors would be hired for those needed academic areas not
represented in the faculty's experience.

Rather than having duplicate and overlapping administrative services being performed at each Learning Center, there would be a Coordinating Center. The Coordinating Center would serve as the policy and administrative headquarters for the College, the locus for basic support services for the Learning Centers. It would house the executive management and academic team: it would serve as the permanent repository for all student records. Its offices would include operations pertaining to admissions; financial aid, academic policies, their monitoring, and evaluation; learning resource development; purchasing; accounting; personnel; printing; supply purchase and distribution; student accounts; institutional and program research and evaluation.

Though the educational program would be operating out of several locations across the State, Empire State College was to be one college . . . a college with its academic program located where the students were.

The Learning Centers were to provide the locus of instruction with facilities for advisement, counseling, and tutoring. They were to serve as communication links to the admissions, records, and administrative services of the Coordinating Center.
The plan was to open a minimum of two Learning Centers during the first year of operation, and to build to a State-wide network of Centers as quickly as resources were provided and as there was sufficient student demand. (Note 50, p.27)

At each of the two Learning Centers originally planned, an Associate Dean or Director would be in charge of the academic program and its administration. There would also be a professional staff member to support the academic program in the areas of counseling and testing, two full-time Mentors, and 20 part-time study tutors (equal to five full-time Mentors). The non-academic staff would number five clerical persons who would handle all the administrative details involved in supporting the Center's students and academic staff. (Appendix E.) No proven formula determined these breakdowns. The pattern was one considered appropriate by the SUNY planning task force.

According to one operational plan, each Learning Center was expected to open with a workload equivalent of 250 full-time students. (Note 50, pp.23-26) Each Center would gradually build to 400 students.

The geographic locations for Learning Centers would be selected from towns and villages located from one end of the State to another: Buffalo, Albany, Binghamton, Syracuse, and Long Island. (Note 50, p.23)
As for facilities, a fully operational Learning Center would include space for an information center, a xerography and mailing room, a lounge-waiting room, faculty and other staff offices, tutorial space, and a room for media equipment storage and use. (Note 50, p.28)

The College was to operate on the principles of shared authority and responsibility. From this, it was felt that a definition of effective organization would emerge as the College grew and matured. The organization of the College, therefore, had to provide the base for this shared responsibility. (Note 42, p.75)

Operational plans. The early size of the College and the nature of its operations depended on two main factors: the scale of available funding, and the location of applicants or potential students. Planners had no assurance that specific sums of money would be appropriated for the new College. Furthermore, if funds were to be available, no one knew the time schedule for their release, the purposes for which they would be appropriated, or the amount of the appropriation. Therefore, two operating scale alternatives were projected in February 1971: (Note 50, p.12)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Year</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76 (ca.)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Year</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students per Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Year</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Plan One was to be realized, in three years time 20 Centers would be established, serving a minimum of 400 students per Center, or 10,000 students. Carrying out Plan One would be an unusual accomplishment!

By July 1971, the College administration decided that the Metropolitan New York Learning Center would be the first to open. The decision was a political one. Students studying at the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations program in New York City (also part of the State University of New York) wanted a degree for their work, not just certificates as they were earning at the Industrial and Labor Relations program. After the announcement of the establishment of Empire State College, they began to persuade the Governor and SUNY Chancellor to open the first Learning Center in New York City. They would comprise its initial student body. Their efforts succeeded

At this time, plans for opening other Learning Centers were also progressing. The Albany Learning Center would open next, in November 1971. The Albany site was selected because of its proximity to the Coordinating Center, and because of the fact that many people from the Capital area had already applied for admission. Moreover, the President was aware of the shortness of time between the opening of the College and the opening of the Learning Center: there was the real possibility, therefore, that staff and Mentor assistance might have to be shared between the Coordinating and Albany Learning Center, at least in the beginning days. That awareness became a reality.

As a means of reaching students in the western part of the State, the Rochester Learning Center was scheduled to open next, in January 1972. After some initial problems in the preparation of the site for occupancy, the small staff moved into the space about three months late. Meanwhile, Mentors and students met in libraries, their homes, and other convenient places.

At that time, other sites were also projected:

(Note 42)
By February 1972, the plan for establishing Learning Centers was expanded to formally include a regional component. The State University was planning to establish four major regional coordinating areas in the State, and Empire State College would have Learning Centers in each of the four regions: Southeastern, Northeastern, Central, and Western. (Note 47, p.5) All Centers would develop satellite locations throughout their regions, again going to where the students were. (Note 39, p.45) Several months after the SUNY regional plan was announced, Empire State's fourth Learning Center opened at Old Westbury on Long Island. Empire State now had a Learning Center in each of the SUNY coordinating regions.

Once established, Learning Center development would take some time. The 1972 Master Plan set forth the expected life history of a Learning Center: (Note 53, p.57)
Stage 1 (approximately one year)

1. Facilities identified and equipped;
2. Full-time staff begin work;
3. Students begin attending orientation workshops and developing Learning Contracts;
4. Enrollment grows to full capacity;
5. Developmental work requires primary attention. Targeted areas include working relationships, effective study programs, tutor and learning resource identification, College-wide operating committee designations with suggested members.

Stage 2

1. Concentration on identifying, development, use and evaluation of a broad base of learning resources;
2. Creation of an approved list of potential tutors and field supervisors.

Stage 3

1. Concentration on the development of cooperative relationships with agencies, organizations, industrial and business firms which would provide on-site possibilities for faculty supervising students who are integrating work and study experiences.
Operational realities. During the year 1971-1972, several Centers were opened. The New York Metropolitan New York Learning Center and its Labor program opened on September 8th in a building provided by the Electrical Workers Benevolent Society in New York City. The Metropolitan Museum of Art was approached to see if its vast collection could be made available to Empire State students as another source of learning resources. An arrangement was made, and an Empire State Mentor was on location in the Museum two days a week in space provided by the Museum.

On November 5th, the Northeast Learning Center opened, situated in office space on the original SUNY at Albany campus.

Later in the year, Empire State's first overseas Unit was opened when a Mentor was sent to London in December to establish the College's first outreach program in an international setting.

In January 1972, the Genesee Valley Learning Center officially opened in Rochester. It occupied space in the joined buildings of the former Sacred Heart Convent and the State University College at Brockport's Liberal Studies Program.

By December 1974, the College was operational in 22 locations throughout the State: in Albany, the Bedford-Stuyvesant portion of Brooklyn, Binghamton, Buffalo, Central

Centers and Units were located in many kinds of space: in a union building, overseas in leased office space in London, on SUNY campuses, in a former convent, public and private psychiatric centers, public health care hospital centers, a botanical garden, an art museum, a factory, and an agency office building. Centers and Units opened where there was a student need and where space was available on a gratis or low-rental basis.

In some cases, Centers or Units had a special program focus: labor studies, art, religion, human services, health care, new career models, business and economics, prisons, or governmental agencies. (Appendix F.)

The Long Island Learning Center wanted to make a special effort to relate closely with agencies and industry, utilizing their intern or apprentice programs, laboratories, specialized libraries, and other facilities for meetings and office space. Employees from the cooperating groups would enroll at the College on a space-available basis. Some would serve as field or intern supervisors for other students at the College. Cooperative programs were established with Sperry Rand, with Suffolk County in
Hauppauge, with the State hospitals in Creedmoor and Central Islip, with the Head Start Program in Hempstead, and with a drug rehabilitation program in Clearwater. As employees' educational needs were served, and/or as program funds were consumed, Units would close.

The Genesee Valley Learning Center in Rochester was situated near Attica. One Mentor spends a day a week working with prisoners and prison employees who are enrolled Empire State students. Similar programs operate out of the Mid-Hudson Unit in New Paltz and the Lower Hudson Learning Center in Suffern.

During April-May 1973, the Labor Studies Program was separated from the regular, more broadly based academic program at the Metropolitan Learning Center. Confusion existed regarding the fiscal and administrative relationship between the two programs; further, the labor studies program was based on classroom work, with a combination of Empire State and ILR faculty members. Students could earn two and four year degrees with a concentration in labor studies, or they could incorporate some labor classes into their learning contracts.

In order to provide academic leadership trained in this area, and to clarify the fiscal and administrative lines, the College administration re-established the labor program as a Center for Labor Studies. The Center remains
a separate Center today.

To further illustrate the nature of special programs at the Learning Centers, and in answer to an expressed need in Rockland County for a program in which people could be trained or re-trained to enter the work force, Empire State obtained funds from the Kellogg Foundation to establish such a program. At the time, Rockland County Community College offered Empire State space in its media center at very reasonable cost. The media center would also be used by Empire State students as a source of informational materials. A two year demonstration program, New Models for New Careers, was established. The program was designed to create new educational models in four areas: allied health, human services, business, and engineering technology. When the funding was expended, the College was not able to subsidize it. The Mentors who were engaged in the program were absorbed into the regular faculty of the Lower Hudson Learning Center.

The College wanted to expand its program in New York City by establishing an urban study program there. Such a program, they felt, would attract students in the greater New York area as well as from other parts of the State, students who would be free to travel and remain in New York City for a specified period of time. External funding was found to launch the program. The following year,
Empire State began to subsidize it, and now the College covers all costs for the Urban Studies Unit. Three Mentors were hired and the rich resources of New York City were built into the students' learning contracts in the areas of art, religion, human services, communications. The program's original intentions are being fully carried out today.

Funding patterns for some special programs have changed with time. In some cases when external funds were not continued, Empire State could absorb the costs and did. Mentors were appointed on regular faculty budget lines, though that budget line may have been supported by external funds. The programs were part of a Learning Center or Unit, and therefore fell under the overall academic policies, procedures, and program evaluations in operation at the Center or Unit. The only disappointment was that, as it turned out, no large numbers of Empire State students from other parts of New York State enrolled in these programs. While the New York City programs, especially served students from New York City, they did not serve students based up-State, or far out on Long Island, for example.

Originally the College-wide Division was to be a network of Learning Units, dispersed throughout the State. The academic program in these Units was to be based on
organized materials, an out-growth of the work of the visiting faculty, and on other learning resources available in each geographic area. The Coordinators of these Units reported to the Dean of College-wide Division. In an effort to bring the Division into the organizational pattern and terminology in effect throughout the College at the time, the College-wide Division was re-titled the Center for State-wide Programs. In reality, it functioned as any other Learning Center except that it had no core faculty in one location. The Dean and all of the Center's student records were located in a building in Saratoga Springs. Instead of having weekly faculty meetings as other Centers did, the faculty came to Saratoga for two or three days each month in order to carry out their evaluation of the overall program, assess student portfolios, conduct faculty reviews, and other on-going work of the Centers. The Dean's office still serves as the administrative center for the Units.

Unit Coordinators of the College-wide Division had the specialized function of administering an organized academic program for small, scattered numbers of students. In his role, the Coordinator synchronized the writing of contracts by students, arranged for tutorial or other instructional support, and acted as Mentor or tutor to a number of students. Coordinators reported to the Dean of
a Learning Center. As "outpost" staff, the Coordinators were also responsible for the academic and administrative quality of their Unit. They had to also marshall the learning resources of the community in support of the program. (46,44)

Coordinator functions as originally defined remained consistent with the original definition of their responsibilities.

The Prospectus for a New University College noted that the Vice-President for Academic Affairs would be responsible for Learning Center coordination and planning. The Prospectus, though, did not spell out any details as to how the Learning Centers would, organizationally, be part of the College's overall planning and administration. In July 1972, in an effort to correct this omission, a Dean for Learning Centers was appointed to carry out direct responsibility for the identification, development, coordination, and general overseeing of all Learning Centers. The Dean for Learning Centers reported directly to the newly appointed Executive Vice-President. (The Executive Vice President's area of responsibility was for the administration and management of all College areas. No Vice-President for Administration had yet been appointed.) All Deans reported to the Executive Vice-President. They worked most closely with the Vice-President for Academic
Affairs on matters of academic policy and program administration, and with the Dean for Learning Centers on administrative matters. The position of Dean for Learning Centers was abolished when a Vice-President for Administration was later appointed.

Regular monthly meetings of the Deans began in 1973, with the Vice-President for Academic Affairs in attendance. They discussed and planned the academic program, its policy and procedures, and related personnel matters. In January 1974, the collective body of Deans joined the College's executive administrative team to form the College's Administrative Council. The Dean's functions remained the same, though their consultative base across the College had been greatly expanded.

Staffing. The Prospectus for a New University College set forth multiple possible staffing patterns based on the size of the student body and the amount of resources which were free to be channeled to this new effort. For example, if in Year One, two Learning Centers were to be operative with 250 students at each Center, a Center would employ nine professional and five clerical staff. A fully staffed Learning Center of 400 students would consist of 15 FTE academic-professional personnel and seven clerical staff. These configurations were based on a 50-1 funding scale and allowed for time to work up to a full complement
of students and faculty. (Note 50, p.27) The academic professional staff members would consist of the Center head, a full-time professional to assist with counseling, two full-time Mentors and the balance would be part-time tutors.

Originally, each Learning Center was to be headed by an Associate Dean or Director. (Note 50, p.27) Coordinators would be responsible for administering the smaller learning operations, or Learning Units. By the time that the first Learning Center opened (September 8, 1971), the title for a Learning Center head had been changed from Associate Dean or Director to Dean. The change reflected the level and scope of academic and administrative responsibility and experience now desired. In addition, the title of Dean would easily fit into customary State University budget patterns. Learning Center Deans needed all of the academic qualifications outlined for Mentors (Note 50, p.21), plus wide experience in the area of educational administration. The Dean would not only oversee the academic program and all Center administrative functions, he would also serve as Mentor to a small number of students, and serve on College-wide policy-making and governance bodies as well. Clearly, a senior academic professional was needed for this role. Each Learning Center has continued to be headed by a Dean since that time.
The Dean's job grew to unmanageable proportions: the workload of developing and overseeing a Center, coordinating the program with the outside developmental resources, and having a limited number of students combined to be too much to a workload. The following year the first Associate Dean was hired. The Associate Dean was to be directly responsible for the academic program: for its quality and student records. The Associate Dean would also serve as Mentor to approximately ten students and serve on College-wide committees. The role and definition of an Associate Dean's job did not change throughout the period, except for one area, that pertaining to learning resources.

Within a year or so, it was agreed that the identification and development of area or local learning resources took a great deal of an Associate Dean's time and that Mentors were, accordingly, looking elsewhere for available learning resources. This function was then gradually transferred to newly created positions titled Assistant Dean. Consequently, Assistant Deans spent the major part of their time with learning resource identification and development. Each also performed as Mentor for 10-15 students. In a year or so, when the Assistant Dean position was evaluated, it was found that Assistant Dean efforts to develop learning resources were not being fully utilized.
Center faculty were continuing to identify and use their own resources, again, resources with which they were familiar. Because of this situation, several Assistant Deans left the College and others requested transfer to full-time teaching assignments. This development took place at varying times, depending on the situation at each Center. At this time, there are no Assistant Dean positions in the College.

A new need later emerged: finding ways to establish assessment counselor-type positions which would relieve Mentors of much of the repetitive assessment counseling activity. When the State did not fund these counselor positions, and there were no non-State monies available at the College to finance them, the College used vacant Assistant Dean budget lines to fulfill this need. The counselors who were hired began to assist students in the preparation of their portfolios of prior learning. Counselors also functioned in some instances as part-time Mentors. The original plan to have counselors at the Centers was finally realized, although on a reduced scale of responsibility.

Another notable change took place in the Center staffing patterns. Originally each Center was to have two full-time Mentors and several part-time tutors, and the Coordinating Center was to have several full-time Mentors
on its staff for the identification, development and testing of learning resources. During the first months of operation, it became apparent that it would be difficult, if not inappropriate, to identify local or area learning resources from a distance. Moreover, guiding students in the use of these resources should be overseen on the local level, where the students were working. Therefore, the original plans were adjusted. Each Learning Center had a core of full-time faculty whose experience represented a broad academic range, and only a few tutors hired on an as-needed basis.

The original intention of hiring a professional staff member to coordinate academic advisement, testing, and scheduling never materialized except in the modified form just noted.

The support staff, the secretarial and clerical staff, materialized as planned and remains in place to this day.

Summary. As we have seen, expressed need and available public or private funding determined the College's ability to open a program in a particular locale for a specified academic program. Staffing and fiscal arrangements would be made with cooperating organizations and institutions. In some cases, office space and secretarial services were provided. In other cases, cross-registration provisions were made between institutions. In still other
cases, making varied learning resources available to Empire State students was a donation to the College. One SUNY College made another arrangement: in exchange for space, secretarial support, and part-time faculty, Empire State and the other college shared the generated FTEs.

Staffing patterns changed from the original concept, because of the need to experiment and find the best way to prepare and deliver learning resources to the students. The process proved to be most effective when the Mentors were involved in the preparation, testing, and evaluation of those learning resources. Hence, a shift of locale for this effort took place from the Coordinating Center to the Learning Centers.

Through the Learning Center-Unit network, many of the College's plans were realized. Students not in large metropolitan areas were being served with regular and special purpose educational programs established on a State-wide basis.

Linkages were established with industrial concerns, governmental agencies, and community groups to offer study opportunities to their employees or group members. In addition, the network serviced a host of students who had applied to the College independent of their employers or group sponsorship. Programs of broad and specialized academic bases had been established and the College had
utilized various types of cooperative arrangements to carry out its purposes.

Though the College's budget expanded each year, it was not possible to carry out Plan One of the originally projected operational scales. When the College was open in 22 locations, 2,769 students were enrolled (Note 12) not the anticipated 10,000. What happened? The answer lies in the fact that the original anticipated operating plan had no budgets attached, only budget formulas for teaching loads. And, as fiscal resources available to SUNY were leveled off and in fact reduced, it wasn't possible to fund Empire State on the level necessary to carry out the establishment of 20 Learning Centers, though the College had one or more faculty in 22 locations. The concept of Regional Learning Centers and Units worked well. Educational opportunities were, indeed, taken to the students as originally envisioned.

Admissions and Enrollment

One of the missions of Empire State College was to serve new students, students not usually found on SUNY campuses. The College was to serve students across New York State, not just those in one geographic location. Were different kinds of admission and enrollment procedures necessary to accommodate this particular mission? How did the process fit into the overall picture? What kinds of
students enrolled?

On February 16, 1971, when the Carnegie Corporation and Ford Foundation announced that they were awarding SUNY one million dollars over a two year period to establish an off-campus degree program, much publicity was given to the proposed non-residential college.

In announcing the grant at a New York news conference, Alan Pifer, President of the Carnegie Corporation, and Harold Howe II, Vice President of the Ford Foundation, claimed that the new program would be one of the largest off-campus degree experiments yet tried in this country. SUNY's Chancellor, Ernest L. Boyer, noted:

that, under present plans, initial enrollment in the State University program will be an estimated 500 to 1,000 students. Students to be served by the College will include: those who can benefit from greater flexibility in the college program; persons who wish to study at home for economic and personal reasons; older, mature individuals who wish to pursue a degree; employed persons who wish to continue part-time college study for career objectives; selected secondary students; and persons who have not completed the bachelor's degrees and who wish to resume college educations. Generally, enrollment will be limited to high school graduates wishing to study at the undergraduate level. (American Council on Education, Note 7) (Chancellor Boyer's full statement is contained in Appendix G.)

Such announcements were widely reported in newspapers, educational publications, news magazines, TV, and radio. Media coverage generated numerous inquiries about admission to this new college. Approximately 8,000 inquiries were received before September 3, 1971. (Note 34) Clearly, an
admissions policy with an effective procedural system had to be in place soon.

Admissions policy. From the beginning, Empire State planned to admit students on a monthly basis at each Learning Center, in order of application date and available Mentor resources. As at all SUNY institutions, Empire State's admissions decisions would be made without regard to the applicant's race, sex, religion, or national origin.

Students would study for credit on a full or part-time basis. It was expected that full-time students would spend 36 - 40 hours a week on their studies. Accordingly, half-time students would spend 18 - 20 hours in pursuit of their studies as outlined and approved by the student's Mentor.

There were to be no non-credit students admitted when the College first opened. With this decision, the College administration and SUNY officials were acknowledging pressures to build FTEs (full-time equivalents) and their related budgetary income. Scarce human and fiscal resources were to be spent on degree seeking students. Also the original Ford and Carnegie grant was to be spent developing a degree program. After the programs and their support mechanisms were established, modifications could always be made to accommodate the non-matriculating student.
Applicants had to possess a high school diploma or its equivalent. An acceptable alternative to a high school education was the demonstration of ability to do college level work by the presentation of documented successful work or life experience and responsibilities. Another admission requirement was that the elected Learning Center had to be able to meet the applicant's educational needs and objectives. In other words, if an applicant wished to study glaciology and the Learning Center had no Mentor or tutor with this particular area of expertise, the applicant would not be accepted. Or, if an applicant's expressed educational objective was to become a certified public accountant, his application could not be accepted because Empire State College was not offering professional licensing programs in any field.

The admissions and enrollment process. The admissions and enrollment process was seen as a way to facilitate the College's mission of reaching new students; to carefully determine if the College would have the needed academic and staff resources to match the designated educational objectives of the applicants; to regulate the numbers of students applying to any one Center at a time; to monitor the lists of those waiting to be admitted; and to use the process as a learning experience for the students. In
contrast, other SUNY Colleges were not concerned with registering students 12 times each year in one location, let alone in multiple locations. Their faculty teaching loads were lighter. Their fiscal plan and academic procedures were firmly in place. Virtually all students began their formal academic program on the first day of classes. Student study loads and faculty teaching loads probably remained rather constant for a semester's period of time.

At Empire State College, the admissions and enrollment process was broken down into several steps.

Step 1: **Initial Inquiry**
As with other academic institutions, initial inquiry could be made at the Coordinating or Learning Center, or at the College administrative headquarters. Inquiries could be made in person, by telephone, or by mail and an information-application packet would be sent to the inquirer.

Step 2: **Investigating the College**
Before applying for admission, applicants were encouraged to explore Empire State's academic program and teaching methods by visiting the Learning Center with which they expected to affiliate. At the Center, they could obtain descriptive information on the
academic program. They could examine the faculty roster and inventories of available persons, places, and resources for learning which were being used at the Center. Sample student learning programs would illustrate varied possible approaches to learning at the College. If applicants wished to contact enrolled students to learn more about the program, they could obtain student names, telephone numbers, and addresses from Center personnel. There were also opportunities for interested applicants to speak with faculty and staff members about the learning process and the student's own role in it.

Step 3: Application

When a potential student decided to apply to the College, he had to file two application forms: the SUNY application and an Empire State College application.

Applicants to all SUNY colleges had to file a SUNY application. (Appendix H contains a sample form.)

Supplementary information could be requested by SUNY Colleges on their own separate
application form. The proposed Empire State College operation and student clientele were expected to differ so widely from that at other SUNY campuses, that Empire State drew up its own supplemental application, the Prospectus. (A sample of this form is included in Appendix I.) The Prospectus was a five-page combination of short answer and essay form questions which asked applicants to identify their educational or occupational background and experience, intended area of study, educational goals, the particular Learning Center at which they would like to study and when they would like to begin their study. This began the process of defining one's experience and educational objectives.

The SUNY application was sent to the University's central admissions processing center which would extract the needed information and forward the application to the specified College. The Empire State Prospectus was sent to the Admissions Office at the Coordinating Center, with a copy of it to the Learning Center designated as the applicant's first choice. The Learning Center's copy
was used to identify what educational resources were going to be needed as Mentors finished working with enrolled students.

**Step 4: Acceptance**

In order to assure an even flow of applicants to each Center in chronological date of application, the Admissions Office notified students of their acceptance as they issued invitations to the Learning Centers' Orientation Workshops.

The exception to this general rule of operation pertained to questionable or early admission applications, which were referred to the Learning Center for review and decision.

**Step 5: Orientation Workshops**

Day long Orientation Workshops were designed to provide opportunities for students and Mentors to become acquainted, for students to become more knowledgeable about College procedures and available resources, for the Mentors to assess student skills, and for general advisement. Attendance at these workshops was not required, only urged or recommended.
In time, Mentors found themselves spending a great deal of time repeating orientation-type information to students on an individual basis. The College administration then decided that all admissible applicants must attend an Orientation Workshop prior to their enrollment. This procedure provided added assurance that students would be familiar with the different-from-usual administrative procedures connected with the Empire State learning experience. It also assured the administration that all students were given the same orientation-type information, a difficult feat when numerous faculty members were previously responsible for covering all aspects of the program each time they had to explain the College to a student!

At an Orientation Workshop, students registered their interest in studying, had the educational philosophy and the administrative procedures of the College explained, were introduced to their faculty advisor or Mentor, began preliminary discussions about their learning contracts, and became acquainted with other students. The learning process was underway.
Step 6: **Mentor Conference and Enrollment**

During the Orientation Workshop, or shortly thereafter, the student enrolled formally by signing an Enrollment Agreement.

(Appendix J) At this point, the student began meeting regularly with his Mentor and developing his first learning contract.

(Note 38)

In March 1972, an admissions, recruitment procedures, and orientation workshop was held by a special task force composed of students, faculty, and administrators. The task force reiterated the College's admission policies:

The admissions policies of Empire State College are designed to admit students of all ages who have a high school diploma or the equivalent of a high school education. No set standard of grade point average or pre-requisite courses will be imposed. The Prospectus will be used as the basic document on which admissions is based. (Note 9, p.1)

The task force report went on to indicate that students would be admitted when Learning Centers could accommodate them. If Mentors with the academic expertise in the student's area of study already had a heavy student load, i.e., over the number budgeted, the student could wait until the Mentor's load decreased, or he could begin working with another Mentor on another aspect of his intended study program. Accordingly, students were to be admitted as the Learning Center could accommodate their
study needs. The existing first-come first-served system of admitting students would continue to be honored.

The College attempted to obtain a mix of students and disciplines as it tried to reach potentially new students. There were no quotas. Acknowledging the relation between the availability of funding to hire Mentors and the numbers of students wanting to enroll, recruitment efforts were to be redirected if a balance between resources and needs was not achieved. In other words, if there was a backlog of business administration students in the admissions file for a particular Learning Center and the business Mentor there could not work with additional students, those wishing to study in other fields were enrolled before those waiting for the business Mentor.

Some months later, the admissions process was again assessed. There was an acknowledged need to streamline the procedures and to reduce staff work load. In addition, the SUNY Central Administration was pressuring the four year colleges about automatically accepting the transferring graduates from the SUNY two year colleges. Another consideration was the amount of administrative and academic time needed to support part-time students. It was felt that it took about the same amount of time to counsel and evaluate a part-time student and his work as it did for a full-time student.
The admissions procedures reassessment, conducted by a faculty-staff committee, resulted in having procedures spelled out in more detail and yet succinctly; form letters were to be used; and Orientation Workshop dates, as well as the number of anticipated student and area of study vacancies, were to be projected on a three month schedule with monthly updates. (Note 3)

The basic process remains in tact today. The only major change made before the time of accreditation in December 1974 pertained to the growing backlog of applications. Learning Centers did not want to maintain copies of the applications in the backlog. The Center Deans and College administrative officers decided that students would complete only one copy of the Prospectus and send it to the Admissions Office. Then, when the applicant's letter of invitation to the Orientation Workshop was sent, a copy of his Prospectus would be made and sent to the Learning Center.

Two other changes were also made at that time: 1) to again reduce the amount of repetitive counseling faculty and staff members had, the applicant was urged to attend a regularly scheduled and publicized College Information Session, rather than to drop in at any time for basic information, and 2) that when the Prospectus was received in the Admissions Office, a card was returned to the
student notifying him of its arrival and with the projected
date of his Orientation Workshop.

At other SUNY colleges, the process was more stream-
lined. Applicants filed only the SUNY application. It
was sent to the college of their choice. If applicants
wanted to be automatically considered for other SUNY
colleges, the application was sent to the SUNY central
applications processing center. The center would file
the application at all colleges indicated by the applicant.
The college accepting the applicant would send out the
letter of acceptance, with notification to the application
processing center of the acceptance and later placement.

In contrast to Empire State procedures, the SUNY
college application process also included the submission
of transcripts, information on elementary and secondary
school experiences, test scores, recommendations, and a
physician's report. Interviews were recommended.

The Empire State admissions policy, then, set the
stage for the College's attempt to reach students who had
not or could not attend conventional colleges. The
procedures indicated the path or process deemed most ap-
propriate to acquaint the applicant with the College's
program and methods of study. Though seemingly involved,
the process also helped students think through their
educational aims and whether or not Empire State was the
appropriate place for them to study. (A flow diagram of this basic advisement process is in Appendix K.)

Recruitment. SUNY, as a public institution in New York State, could not legally advertise for students. In order to monitor the nature of recruitment activities, the Empire State administration decided that overall recruitment plans were to be monitored by the Coordinating Center staff.

Various media, listings in educational publications, mailings in answer to Coordinating and Learning Center inquiries, and mass mailings to identified student publics were used to tell the Empire State story as a public service, not as an advertisement for the recruitment of students.

Recruitment activities took the form of individual interviews, displays, information sessions for groups at the Learning Centers, and visits to regular meetings of prospective student groups. (Note 9, p.3) Materials describing the College program were developed. These and copies of external publicity received were shipped in quantity to the Learning Centers as give-away information.

The Coordinating Center was to be primarily responsible for recruitment in the geographic areas of new Learning Centers; existing Centers recruited students in
their own areas. No market surveys were needed to determine the location of new Centers. The number of applicants in the backlog which were from a particular locale, and whether or not fiscal resources were available, were the determinants in deciding if a Center should be established in a particular location.

In November 1972, recruitment efforts were underway in three geographic regions: the Genesee Valley area for the Rochester Learning Center, in Metropolitan New York City, and in the Northeastern part of the State for the Albany Center. The Coordinating Center detailed a staff member to prepare news releases. (Note 4) Faculty and staff visited two-year colleges, high school counselors, and community groups. Invitations to visit the Centers were issued. Descriptive information was distributed. Interest questionnaires were distributed to high school and two-year college students in the Albany and Rochester areas. All high schools in a 50 mile radius of these two cities received a copy of the College's Bulletin (or catalog) and an invitation to visit a Learning Center.

Not too far into the campaign, the New York City Center situation presented a problem: it was difficult to find enough faculty to deal with all those enrolled. The Center's further participation in recruitment ceased. (Note 26)
As materials were more widely distributed and people became more aware of the College program, Centers experienced backlogs of applications; and so, all recruitment efforts were discontinued.

Recruitment results. The organized recruitment program at the College was minimal and short-lived. The College program generated enough publicity that after the initial months, there was always a backlog of applicants for the Centers. The publicity described the academic program and learning methods adequately enough to, in effect, create a kind of pre-screening device. Very few people applied who were not qualified, or whose educational needs could not be met by the College.

By October 1971, approximately 9,550 inquiries had been received, with an estimated 8,000 of these received prior to July 1971. One hundred eighty-eight applications for admission had also been received by this time. By the end of December, 254 students had been admitted and another 69 applicants were on the waiting list. (Note 5)

By the end of June 1974, inquiries were arriving at an increased rate of 20 percent over the previous year, 48 each working day or 12,240 for the year. Applications were up 35 percent, and enrollments increased 43 percent from 1,458 to 2,059. (Note 28) At the time of
accreditation in December 1974, enrollment had reached 2,769. (Note 62)

What kind of student enrolled? Did the College reach new students?

Age ranges. The ages of students admitted to the first Albany workshops (in October and November of 1971) broke somewhat evenly into three categories. (Note 4) About one-third the number of those admitted fell into each of the following age ranges: 17 - 25, 26 - 40, and over 40.

In the group of 510 students surveyed in April 1975, age information reflected somewhat similar breakdowns, though the age ranges were slightly different:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ages 16 - 24</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 25 - 44</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 44</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average age of Empire State students was reported to be 33.4 years. (Note 44)

In January 1975, just after the December accreditation, another survey of the 2,941 enrolled students was made. (Note 6). The age ranges were modified again, making comparisons difficult:
Ages 16 - 20  4%
Ages 21 - 30  35%
Ages 31 - 40  27%
Ages 41 - 50  20%
Over 50  10%
Unknown  4%
100%

The average had now climbed to 37. (More detailed tables are contained in Appendix L.)

Compared to SUNY undergraduate student characteristics, Empire State enrolled new students, students not usually attending SUNY campuses. Observing the results of surveys made of Empire State and SUNY students enrolled in the Fall of 1974, the findings indicate that 73 percent of the SUNY students were 24 years old or younger (Note 46), while only 16 percent of the Empire State students were in that same age range. The differences continued as the upward ranges were reported: (Note 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>ESC</th>
<th>SUNY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 59</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Male-female representation. At the end of October 1971, of the 58 admitted, 55 percent were male. The following month, 54 more students were admitted, half
male and half female. (Note 4)

On April 1, 1973, the male-female ratio again appeared somewhat constant: 55 percent of the 510 students were male.

In a June 1974 survey, 46 percent of the students were male. (Note 17) Interestingly enough, the ratio remained a rather constant 50 - 50 balance, though there had been no plan to have such a balance among the students. Using these same studies, both Empire State and SUNY reported a somewhat balanced male-female ratio. Empire State reported a 49 - 51 percent ratio, and SUNY reported a 51 - 49 percent ratio. (Note 46, p.3) (Sixty-eight percent of the Empire State students were married. There are no figures available on single and married SUNY students.)

Occupations. A survey made a year later in the Fall of 1975 (Note 45) revealed that 70 percent of Empire State graduates were occupied in areas categorized as professional, semi-professional, and supervisor/public official. At the time of entry, this group represented 65 percent of the reported occupations. Other category percentages remained pretty constant, though the homemaker group declined from 8 to 3 percent. Another exception was the unemployed group, which rose from three to five percent, reflecting the State's recession and high unemployment at
that time. (Tables, with occupational breakdowns and definitions, are in Appendix M.)

Educational experience. Another indicator supported the statement that Empire State College did serve students not usually attending typical four-year undergraduate institutions. At the beginning of 1975, an Empire State College survey (Note 43) indicated that 31 percent of the Empire State students had had no post-secondary education at all, and that 43 percent had had only one or two years. In a June 1972 (Note 24) survey, 41 percent had had more than two years of college, 40 percent two years or less, and 19 percent possessed only a high school diploma.

Educational goals. Two studies were conducted on the intended areas of study of those enrolled as of June 1972 (Note 24) and June 1974. (Note 17) The June survey revealed that the largest percentages of students were studying the arts and social sciences. The later survey indicated continued high interest in the arts, but higher interest in social services, and in business and economics. (A detailed chart is in Appendix N.)

Again, because of evolving more detailed research patterns in the young college, the categories for the areas of study were expanded in the second study; they now matched the titles of approved areas of study offered by the College. Making exact comparisons is, therefore, not
possible. However, the information seems to reveal no significant shifts in interests. Similar data on SUNY students' educational goals are not available.

**Full-time/part-time ratios.** The publicity materials indicated that students could study full or part-time. The first applicants offered admission at the Albany October 1971 workshop included 20 full-time and 18 half-time students. The November workshop admitted 20 full-time and 34 half-time students. (Note 4) The ratio was approximately 50 - 50.

Of those admitted at all Centers during the first six months of 1972, 47 percent were studying on a full-time basis. (Note 24)

On April 1, 1973, the College's Office of Institutional Research reported that 61 percent of the 1500 enrollees were studying full-time. (Note 13) At the end of December 1974, of the 2,769 students enrolled, 48 percent were studying on a full-time basis. (Note 12) The ratio began as an approximate 50 - 50 ratio, dropped to 47 - 53, rose to 61 - 39, and returned to the more even 48 - 52 basis.

During these same times, the SUNY enrollment percentages for full and part-time students remained rather even. In 1971, 64 percent were full-time students and 36 percent part-time. In 1974, the ratio was 68 - 38 percent. (Note 54, p.3) It was apparent that Empire State was
enrolling a larger number of part-time students than the traditional residential SUNY campuses. It was serving a student population not regularly enrolled at other SUNY colleges.

**Why did students select Empire State College?** A survey of Empire State graduates (Note 35, p.4) revealed that 53 percent selected the College because of the scheduling flexibility offered in Empire State learning modes. Another 43 percent found the College's philosophy appealing. Almost 20 percent were attracted by the opportunity to have their prior experience evaluated. Other reasons offered included: the College offered the quickest way to get a degree (12%), credit for prior formal education was available (11%), and because their educational interest areas were not offered elsewhere (5%). The combination of scheduling flexibility, credit for prior learning, and philosophical appeal counted for "the vast majority of reasons articulated." (Note 35, p.5)

Another of the early aims for Empire State College was to have learning opportunities available to qualified residents throughout New York State. A Fall 1975 research report (Note 14) indicated that students from only sparsely populated counties in the State were not represented in the Empire State College student body. Because of the needed close student-Mentor relationship, a large majority
of the out-of-State students were from neighboring states. Ten foreign students had transferred to the College; two came to the United States when the London Program was closed, and one traveled from Germany to the Metropolitan New York Center to meet with his Mentor.

Who were Empire State College students? Did they have a good experience? The first degrees were granted in September 1972. By June 1973, 82 students had earned the A.A., A.S., B.A., and B.S. degrees. During the year which ended on June 30, 1974, the total number of graduates was 444. (Note 28) At the time of accreditation in December of that year, the number had grown to 911.

One indicator of a College's "success" is the size of its student body which continues to pursue its educational goals in graduate school. In 1975, almost half (44 percent) of Empire State's graduates sought advanced training and education at graduate levels, and three-quarters (74 percent) of those who applied to graduate schools were accepted. (Note 18)

The graduates included in the study also reported on the range of institutions to which they had applied: (Note 19) The majority had applied to comprehensive colleges and universities, with fewer to doctoral granting institutions and leading research universities. (Details
of the survey are noted in Appendix 0.)

Several impacts of their learning experience were also reported:

- Personal Development: 44%
- Academic Gains: 33%
- Professional Development: 10%

Benefits such as improved self-confidence, the attainment of a degree, and increased independence were also rated as important by the respondents.

Graduates also reported difficulties they had encountered during their enrollment at the College:

- Administrative Procedures: 20%
- Program Features: 15%
- Mentor Problems: 15%
- Other: 15%
- No Problems/Response: 35%

Of the 147 graduates who had been in graduate school for at least one semester, the overwhelming majority (92 percent) stated that their Empire State program preparation was moderately good or very good. Four percent indicated their experience was negative and four percent did not answer. The two most frequently cited Empire State learning experiences that graduates found not useful in graduate school were: Empire State flexibility and independence. (Note 15)
Implications of the admissions/enrollment process. As illustrated in the section on academic record keeping and in this section, different administrative practices are needed for different student populations and educational modes of learning.

Students who remain on campus for an academic year or longer, rather than step out when business or personal aspects of their lives interrupt their studies, do not need the same kind of administrative flexibility as regards to billing for tuition and fees, Mentor or faculty workload configuration. Students who experience job transfers need a back up administrative support system which can accommodate these interruptions without loss of study time.

The Empire State student would begin his program of study as soon as a Mentor and the student agreed on the general area of study. They would outline a learning contract and the student began studying. This could happen at the Orientation Workshop or soon thereafter, whenever the student and Mentor were able to meet. The College felt that the student's learning began with the designing of the learning contract. Therefore, the student signed an Enrollment Agreement as soon as he and his Mentor began their work. The Enrollment Agreement engaged the onset of tuition costs and the consequent billing process. Therefore, billing began with the first advising/learning
activity.

With students entering the College (and graduating from it) in multiple locations across the State each month in the calendar year, the College's admission and graduation process was a continuous one, operating 12 times a year rather than like one at an institution which admits and graduates students two or three times a year.

Because most applicants had home responsibilities or worked, Orientation Workshops also had to be scheduled at times convenient to the students. If a student couldn't attend an Orientation Workshop on the designated date, or if he couldn't begin studying on the specified date, he was allowed to attend another workshop or begin when convenient to him and his Mentor. All students didn't register for their academic program on the same registration day, nor did they graduate on a date prescribed a year or so in advance as they would in a college with more conventional organizational, administrative, and academic procedures.

Well conceived, informative, and widely dispersed publicity can generate an excessive number of applications. Information in the publicity was apparently complete enough and appropriately articulated for the intended publics. These factors played a part in the fact that the College could accept virtually all applications it received.
Summary. The Empire State College admission policy as originally stated was carried out successfully. Older, working students with clearly defined academic goals were being enrolled at learning locations across the State as fast as resources would permit. The enrollment process appeared to be a bit cumbersome with two applications and the need to visit a Learning Center; however, the process did acquaint applicants with the unusual academic and administrative processes involved at the College. The process also helped the student to think through his own educational goals and ways to achieve them. Nobody prescribed the components of this degree program with a specified curriculum as would be found at other colleges.

Academic Record Keeping

Original purpose and plan. From the beginning, there was an acknowledged need for the administrative staff to establish, maintain, and preserve academic records for each student. The Prospectus for a New University College stated: "The administrative staff will be responsible for maintaining student academic records . . . (Note 50, p.37)

These records would track and record the academic activity of each student, providing the deemed necessary information upon which to make judgements pertaining to admission, the learning which took place, how the learning
was evaluated, the individual's degree requirements and how they were met.

How is it done elsewhere? Customary record keeping practices differ, depending on local circumstances. Generally, though, an admissions office establishes, maintains, and stores all records related to a prospective student's inquiry and admission. Once a student is admitted, the student's School or Department establishes a file on each student. An individual faculty member may or may not maintain a file for each student. Papers submitted and tests taken may be returned to the student, with the faculty member recording only a letter or numerical grade for each work submitted. The student's semester's overall grade would be sent to the registrar for inclusion in the student's permanent record. A composite of each semester's grades would then be recorded on the student's transcript.

The Empire State process. Inquiries were received in the mail, by telephone, or during a visit to the Learning Centers or Coordinating Center. Basic questions were originally answered with copies of published articles about the College and a pamphlet, later with the College Catalog, or Empire State Bulletin.

Prospective students were asked to become familiar with the printed materials and then to visit the nearest
Learning Center, where they would have an opportunity to speak with faculty, staff and students. They would also be able to learn about various academic programs which were available, to become familiar with the faculty's areas of expertise, and to obtain an application for admission.

Once the prospective student decided to enroll, he would complete the application or Prospectus and mail it to the Coordinating Center's Admissions Office. When the Learning and Coordinating Centers staff members determined that the applicant's learning goals could be met at the Learning Center, the Coordinating Center staff would send a letter of acceptance to the student. The letter would also contain a date for the student to attend an Orientation Workshop. A copy of his Prospectus would also be sent to the Learning Center.

At the Orientation Workshop, the student would learn more about Empire State's own approach to learning; he would also have the opportunity to explore his educational goals with the faculty.

At subsequent meetings with the faculty member assigned to him, the student would begin designing his learning contract with his Mentor. Later the Mentor would be the evaluator for the work completed.
Differences and their rationale. At Empire State College, individual faculty members would retain the documents which supported each individual student's learning contract work, along with a copy of the enrollment agreement and any withdrawal agreements. Detailed narrative evaluations of each learning contract would replace the customary letter grades and numbers of semester credit hours earned.

The student and his Mentor would also draw up an individualized degree program, supporting the individual's educational goals as they fell within the academic program guidelines set forth by the College. The degree program and each learning contract's evaluation would be approved by the Learning Center's Dean or designee, a faculty review committee at the Center, and the Vice-President for Academic Affairs.

There were several reasons why the founding fathers wanted such a comprehensive record system established and maintained for each student.

The College was new. Its reputation for a quality academic program administered by a qualified faculty had yet to be earned.

The College was to be an integral part of the State University of New York system. Its practices had to accommodate the individual's academic program, yet mesh
with standards of the State Education Department, and with the standards and procedures created by the College and approved by the State University.

Teaching methods were to be different. Full explanations or rationale to support the study program and of the criteria used for the evaluation of that learning were therefore needed.

Credit was to be awarded for learning which had been gained outside a conventional classroom. Awarding academic credit for such learning had to be fully explained and documented, clearly indicating how the learning was equivalent to that which took place in the classroom and how it related to one's approved degree program.

Students would not be enrolling for a usual time period of a semester, academic year, or summer session. Students would be able to interrupt their learning, to withdraw and re-enroll at any time, and for any length of time. A flexible, comprehensive record keeping system would be necessary to facilitate accurate billing for tuition and fees for each enrollment period. The system also had to create and maintain a record of what academic work was planned and accomplished. The College's administrative officers felt that such a computerized integrated academic and administrative support system would economize time and effort.
Early accreditation would be sought. Regional accrediting and evaluation teams, along with the State Education Department's team, would surely be looking for complete documentation which would reflect what learning took place, how it fit into the approved degree program plan, the criteria used for evaluation, and the methods of evaluation, and the credentials of the Mentors and evaluators.

Students would not be located on one campus, close to their permanent records in the registrar's office. Further, students were permitted to study at other Empire State learning locations. If their families or jobs took them to a different site, they were free to enroll at another Learning Center. Therefore, records had to be easily transferable; they had to have a uniform format which eased the process of recognition, understanding, and use; they also had to be kept current and readily available.

Transcripts were to be issued from an institutional source, rather than from a Learning Center . . . in other words, from a College Registrar, rather than from a department or Dean's office on a traditional campus. Current, complete records for each student had to be in one central location.

Quality control was easier when exercised from a
central point, rather than from 20 - 30 learning sites. Empire State was to be a college where learning took place in many towns and cities across the State; it was not to be an institution with many disparate educational programs, each with its own identity, faculty, and standards. Though geographically dispersed, the College was to be one integrated institution, with an integrated yet inter-related and flexible academic program.

The Empire State College approach. The Vice-President for Academic Affairs was to be responsible not only for the quality of the academic program, but also for the maintenance of adequate records for all aspects of the academic program.

As part of the Office of Academic Affairs, a Director of Admissions, Records, and Financial Aid was appointed in September 1971. Under his leadership, a clear definition of "academic records" emerged with experience. All records pertaining to the customary admissions and registrar functions would be housed in the Coordinating Center under the supervision of the Director. All other documents relating to the actual academic experience at the Learning Centers would be maintained at the Centers.

The original, temporary system of keeping other academic records at the Coordinating Center was based on a plan of free access to a computer. The computer would
keep track of inquiries, applications, indication of which Learning Center the applicant desired, the names of those applicants invited to Orientation Workshops and those waiting to be invited, the names of those admitted and those who had signed the enrollment form. Current and projected enrollment figures would also be computed.  
(Note 17) Eventually, all academic information for each student would be stored in the computer.

When students were invited to attend an Orientation Workshop, the student's hard copy file would be sent from the Coordinating Center to the Learning Center. A copy of Part I of the application, or Prospectus, would be retained in the student's file at the Coordinating Center's Record Office. (A copy of the Prospectus is contained in Appendix I.)

Records which related to the student's academic work with his Mentor would be retained at the Learning Center in hard copy form: learning contracts and their evaluations, papers written by the student, experiential logs, tutor and supervisor reports, any test scores, etc.

Hard copy transcript data would be kept at the Coordinating Center and would eventually be entered into the computer: the evaluation of the student's prior learning experiences, information contained in transcripts from other institutions, brief descriptions of learning
contracts, indication that the final contract was in progress, the number of contracts completed and their evaluations, the number of months of credit granted, the date and kind of degree received.

How did the design actually work? Within a year of opening, the Learning Center Deans began devising their own record systems and forms to transmit information to the Coordinating Center's Records Office. They designed a Notification of Intent to Develop a Learning Contract form, a Degree Program Completion Notification, a (readiness for) Degree Conferral memo, a Learning Contract and Amendment form, and an Application for Program Approval. (Note 29) These were to be the basic formal academic records for each student.

Problems emerged. Numerous systems and forms were being used and, on occasion, information was being transmitted by memo and/or telephone. At the time, the computer system was not fully operative and, therefore, a hard copy backup system had to be maintained. Furthermore, it was difficult to prepare and verify transcripts when all of the needed information was not at the Coordinating Center. (Note 25) Four months later, on December 22, 1972, the Learning Center Deans' prerogative of maintaining student records according to their own system was
challenged by the Director of Admissions, Records, and Financial Aid. With a projected 155 percent enrollment growth within the coming year, the Director urged the Deans to consider establishing a "committee to make and administer the admissions policies of the college." (Note 23) The Director wished to avoid having an ever-expanding variety of policies and procedures in operation throughout the growing institution. If such a situation were allowed to continue, he felt that Empire State College would then be one institution in name only. Furthermore, the College was seeking to serve a broad array of students with a wide variety of backgrounds and interests; and it was to do this on a schedule of monthly admissions at each learning site. This rolling admissions plan, coupled with the fact that the nature of the students' academic records were so different than at other institutions of higher learning, impelled the Director to move the College toward a more uniform record keeping system.

The Director's efforts succeeded. Within six months, in May 1973, he obtained approval from the College's Administrative Council to have a Learning Contract Digest and Evaluation form printed and used by all the Centers. (Note 28, p.3)

Another problem which arose pertained to the preparation of documents. The Learning Contract Digest and
Evaluations, part of the student's official transcript, had been sent to the Coordinating Center in various conditions: with inaccurate spellings, some were partially handwritten or typed with different sized type and on different sizes of paper, and so on. Each had to be retyped in the Records Office in order to assure a neat and uniform format and external document. Consequently, delays of up to six weeks to issue transcripts were being experienced. In addition, the Learning Contracts, their evaluations, and information pertaining to the evaluation of prior learning were not being sent to the Coordinating Center promptly. Another reason for the delays was that the Coordinating and Learning Center staff members were unable to keep up with their workloads. At the Coordinating Center, approximately 100 transcript requests were arriving each month. At that time, the Records Office staff consisted of the Registrar and one secretary.

At this same time, the Director expressed concern (Note 22) about the need for another type of record system, a system for special students, i.e., visiting students from other institutions who wished to study with the College on a short-term basis, participants in special short-term residency programs, and those studying at the College's Learning Unit in London. There existed no provision on the application, or Prospectus, for an
applicant to express his interest in these kinds of diversified learning programs. If applicants could indicate such an interest on their application, the computer could then store and return the information as special programs were developed. Due to the computer services staff's lack of time and other determined institutional priorities, no such system for special students was adopted. Records were kept in a separate alphabetical file of manilla folders in the Records Office.

By March of 1973, the record keeping system for regular students had been well enough established that the Admissions, Records, and Financial Office issued a manual with detailed procedures relating to the handling of transcript records: the Enrollment Agreement, papers pertaining to the assessment of prior experience, the Degree Program Approval, Learning Contracts, Contract Digest and Evaluations, Transcript Summary, Leave of Absence/Withdrawal Notice, Notification of Terminal Contract, the Recommendation for Graduation, the preparation of monthly graduation lists for the SUNY Board of Trustees, and the request for Transcript forms. (Note 32)

In July 1973, an ad hoc committee established by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs examined the admissions process and recommended a "centralization and, therefore, hopefully a standardization of the academic process."
(Note 10) One result of the deliberations was that automatically typed form letters would be used more extensively, as would printed standardized forms for most academic records. Another result was the expanded use of the admissions procedures manual.

During 1974, when the College was involved in the institutional self-study evaluation requested by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the need for a central permanent record center became apparent. In September, the Executive Vice-President asked the Director of Admissions, Records, and Financial Aid to draw up plans for such a system and to have it operational in two months. (Note 36, p.2) The resulting file system would be set up with each student's file to include admission documents, learning contracts and their evaluations, the portfolio of prior learning which had been assessed, the Degree Program, and the final transcript. These documents were to be a consolidated file of records for current students and graduates. The graduates' files were to be fully established prior to the State and regional accrediting teams visits. The Learning Centers, therefore, sent their academic records to the Coordinating Center, so that the first integrated files could be established. The task of establishing the graduate files was completed on schedule and the resulting
consolidated files served as the prototype system for what was to be each student's own permanent record at the College.

In November, the College's Record and Information Center was formally established. Because of the particular interest and expertise of one member of the Office of Administration, the Records and Information Center was established under the direction of that office, rather than in the Office of Academic Affairs. The registrar's function was also transferred. With the later appointment of a Vice-President for Administration, the organizational locale for student record keeping was then considered an appropriate function and responsibility of the College's administrative services staff.

What constituted a student record? A permanent record was established for each student when an Enrollment Agreement was signed. The hard cover file was divided into three sections. One section would contain the original copies of all documents needed for a transcript and graduation. Another section was for the original copy of all learning contracts. The third section was reserved for all documents related to the assessment of prior learning. When a student graduated or became inactive, the financial file in the Student Accounting Office was added to the file
folder in the Records and Information Center and later stored.

The admissions file consisted of the original inquiry, the SUNY application, an invitation to an Orientation Workshop at the Learning Center or Unit, and any correspondence with the student. When the student attended the Orientation Workshop and signed the Enrollment Agreement, the admissions file was transferred to the Records and Information Center to become the first section of the student's permanent file. (Appendix P lists the documents in each student's file.)

The documents in Section II of each file included all the student's academic documents: enrollment agreements and withdrawal forms; learning contracts, amendments, and evaluations; transcripts from other institutions; the program of study or degree program; notices of transfer from one Center or Unit to another; cross-registration agreements with other institutions; the notice of final contract; the Center's recommendation for graduation; a copy of the President's letter of congratulations notifying him that he was recommending him to the SUNY Board of Trustees for his degree; the diploma name information; enrollment certification information; and correspondence.

The assessment deliberations, outcomes, and portfolio of prior learning prepared by the student comprised Section
III of each student's file.

The Records and Information Center staff was responsible for entering all information from the actual academic records into the computer, and for the filing of all documents in each student's file. (The admissions and student accounting office staff members entered and filed information relevant to their own areas.) At this time, the Records staff consisted of two professional people (the Registrar and a Director, who also had responsibilities in other areas of the College), a file clerk, a secretary to the Director, and two other secretaries who assisted the Registrar with the issuance of transcripts, the filing and entering of information, the coordination of academic and financial clearances, Veteran counseling, enrollment certifications, the graduation process, and the issuing of diplomas.

What worked and didn't work? Though the process of establishing and maintaining student records was complicated and the number of documents numerous, the record keeping system ran rather smoothly. The only serious problem was that of student billings. Originally, students would be billed each 16 weeks on a selected upper/lower division, full-time/part-time, resident/non-resident basis. The billing would be continuous until the student withdrew,
changed his level of study, or his status (full-time/part-time). Inasmuch as students were to be able to step in and out of their academic program at any time, a complicating factor for record keeping arose. Taking advantage of the flexible withdrawal or intermission provisions, students began to step in and out frequently for short periods of one to two weeks. Because as withdrawal and enrollment agreements must be signed by the student, Mentor, and Associate Dean each time such an activity took place, the processing of necessary papers relevant to enrollment and withdrawal could overlap. In cases like this, documents were back-dated, causing further problems.

Another complication was that the evaluation of a student's prior learning took place after the student had enrolled. Depending on the amount of credit earned through the evaluation of prior learning, a student might become an upper division student while he was being billed as a lower division student. Consequently, retroactive billing had to take place, because SUNY had different tuition rates for upper and lower division students. Financial records had to indicate that tuition and fees had been billed and paid for time periods similar to those of study on each academic level.

A billing term of 12 weeks was instituted in an attempt to help regularize the student accounting process.
The same problems persisted. Staff morale dropped. Confidence in the system and in staff capabilities eroded. Staff changes were made. The workload continued to be overburdening. Staff members were so busy trying to solve problems, that they couldn't keep up with the process of vouchering for financial aid funds, nor with the process of collecting tuition and fees. This created further problems. Student bills were not very descriptive. Consequently, questions had to be answered not only about what the billing amounts represented, but also about their calculation. Billings were, therefore, delayed as efforts were made to unscramble the billing problems.

Students began to disregard their bills, and it became necessary to send second and third notices about amounts due. If bills weren't then paid by a specified period, student names had to be reported to the State's Attorney General for collection purposes. Hundreds of such names were reported periodically.

The process for obtaining and maintaining each student's academic records at the Coordinating Center worked, though the process entailed an unexpected heavy use of copying machines. In time, forms were printed on pre-collated sets of chemically treated paper, and the copy machines weren't used quite as heavily.

Amendments to the original learning contracts were
now to be recorded on such a special form. Pressures to show "satisfactory academic progress" from agencies granting students financial aid, together with the College's own desire to have accurate counts of the number of active students working with each Mentor had forced the use of yet another form, a Learning Contract Outcome Form.

Throughout this period of refining the administrative system which supported the academic program, other forms were combined, modified, or eliminated.

Additions were made to the records staff and the College-wide system was in place in just over a year's time. Transcripts were generally in the mail 48 hours after academic and financial clearances were verified and questions about the status of a student's record could be answered quickly, during telephone calls or by note.

**Summary.** New students, utilizing a variety of learning methods in their study, need new or different administrative structures to support their academic program. One such area of a modified support system is academic record keeping.

Records supporting this kind of academic program are numerous; approval processes are involved; timetables and procedures for the completion, approval, and transmittal
of these records are detailed and comprehensive. There is need for a clear definition of and understanding for what constitutes formal and informal (permanent or interim) "academic records", their needed systems and forms, as well as for sufficient support staff.

Mentors and administrators need to be frequently available to students, and at a variety of times. Special materials and training sessions are needed to familiarize students, faculty and staff as record keeping pertains to their roles in the student's learning experience.

Creating and maintaining academic records for persons involved in individualized or directed independent study which takes place at numerous locations of the College, therefore, require special attention to the formulation, preparation, use, and storage of such records.

**Personnel and Staffing**

Any institution or organization needs personnel to carry out its purposes or objectives. Institutional personnel set objectives, establish policy, determine procedures, carry out those procedures, and evaluate the overall activity. Organizations with different aims have different staffing patterns, depending on the nature of the organization, its mission, structure, size, location, and resources. Empire State College was no exception. However, Empire
State College was no exception. However, Empire State was to be an unusual college, a "non-traditional" college without a campus, without classrooms, living and recreational facilities, libraries and laboratories. It would, therefore, have personnel needs and staffing patterns which were different from those found at "traditional" campuses. What were these differences?

What personnel policies were there? Personnel policies for Empire State College would be the same as those for the State University. Certain exceptions were anticipated:

1. For budgetary purposes only, faculty would be assigned the normative titles of Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Instructor. Functional titles, Mentor, adjunct faculty member, and tutor would be used to clearly indicate the nature of the faculty relationship to the student.

2. To allow flexible hiring practices which would answer student needs and match available resources, liberal use would be made of qualified rank, i.e., part-time, temporary, and lecturer titles.

3. Appointments would be made by the President after consulting widely with appropriate staff members. With such a small staff and no separate academic departments or schools, the President would be
involved in all phases of the hiring process.

4. In SUNY, when full-time faculty members at another State University college were to be employed to teach one or more courses elsewhere, they would normally be employed at the second campus on an overload basis. Empire state, though, would hire them on a full-time basis, asking them to take a leave of absence. This was one source of qualified faculty who would be familiar with SUNY and who would not be giving up any benefits by transferring to Empire State College for a year or two. In fact, many thought that teaching Empire State students would be an interesting change of pace in their careers.

5. Faculty were to be employed for 10 - 12 month obligations. At the outset, though, the 12 month appointment would be recommended for all full-time faculty. To date, no ten month appointments have been made: it was soon discovered that all faculty hired for twelve months were needed for the full twelve month period.

6. The College would experiment with new kinds of professional leaves for faculty and staff, in keeping with the expected heavy demands of the College's instructional program and the desire
to experiment with new forms of professional development. (Note 50, p.35)

According to New York State law, clerical and technical staff would be members of the State's Civil Service. Only individuals hired on grant monies would not be regular employees, academic and non-academic.

Typically, SUNY's four year colleges served students between the ages of 18 and 22. Students came to the campus for their classroom learning. The academic calendar was nine or ten months long, with a summer session. Campus facilities were complete with nearly everything students needed while they lived and learned at the campus. Faculty and student resource needs were generally available to them in the campus library or bookstore. Faculty usually taught in the discipline in which they were trained. The curriculum was a set one for each academic major and degree sought; and so, students followed a similar curricular pattern. Faculty taught nine to twelve class hours each week, attended departmental meetings, published, and conducted their own research.

The non-teaching staff consisted of a support staff of secretaries, technical or research assistants, dormitory counselors, groundsmen, a security force, librarians, fiscal officers and the like. The professional teaching and non-teaching staff members were unionized; the
secretarial and business office clerks were part of the State's Civil Service. The non-teaching professional and support staff members worked a 12 month year, while teaching staff members were hired on a nine or ten month contract.

How would Empire State College be staffed? Empire State College was to be a different kind of SUNY college. It was to serve a different kind of student, one who couldn't or didn't wish to attend class regularly. Its teaching methods were to be different than those usually found at other colleges. It was to take opportunities for higher education to the people, from one end of the State to another, rather than to expect them to come to a campus setting. It was to involve the student in determining his own study program, rather than have the student follow a fixed curriculum. The regular academic term was to be 12 months, not nine or ten. Personnel, academic as well as non-academic, were on 12 month contracts. Accordingly, the personnel and staffing patterns at Empire State College would be somewhat different from those in operation at other SUNY colleges.

After the proposed College's mission, academic program, and potential student clientele were projected, the originating SUNY task force set about to determine the nature of the College's personnel and staffing patterns. Original
plans (Note 50, p.29) called for a President and one or two Vice-Presidents, depending on the size student body realized. To begin with, one Vice-President would work closely with the President and have broad academic and administrative responsibilities. He would, in essence, be a deputy President.

Other officers would be appointed as they were needed and as resources became available. As is the practice elsewhere, the professional staff would support the work of the President and faculty in the areas of admissions, records, finance and management, financial aids, and in other administrative areas. At Empire State, though, two other areas were added: learning resource development and publication, and the assessment of prior learning. (See Appendix E.)

There being no comparable college set up in the SUNY system, the nature of staffing patterns and kinds of personnel needed had to be determined without benefit of any SUNY formulas. The task force members, therefore, had to project staffing patterns for varying sized potential student bodies: (Note 50, p.32)
### Professional Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>2,000</th>
<th>10,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Relations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Academic Program</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Support Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President for Administration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Support Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Professional Staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Clerical and Technical Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>2,000</th>
<th>10,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Staff Support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Staff Support</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Clerical and Technical Staff</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How was Empire State College originally staffed? In July 1971, the proposed staffing plan began to be realized, though in somewhat different patterns from was was originally projected. (Note 20)

Administrative staff was needed immediately to begin carrying out the plans which established the College. Where would experienced people come from on an immediately-available basis? Coincidentally, with the establishment of the new College, the SUNY Central Administration was
retrenching some of its programs and staff members. The Chancellor, therefore, decided to transfer several people in those positions to Empire State, people who had experience appropriate to the needs of the new College. To assist the fledgling College, an Acting Director (who was later given the title of President), a Vice-President for Academic Affairs, his assistant, 12 professionals, and a few secretarial people were transferred from responsibilities at the University's Central Administration to Empire State.

In a gesture of support for the SUNY effort, the State's Division of Budget delayed the cessation of the funding for those particular budget lines until the end of the fiscal year, when it expected that the Legislature would appropriate new funds for the College.

Inasmuch as this College would be opened in a few months, there was not the same amount of planning time available as there was when other SUNY colleges were planned. (In some cases, planning for a new SUNY college took two years or longer.) It was, therefore, all the more necessary to have a solid administrative group, with teaching experience, immediately on board. That such people were available, and that they also had SUNY experience was indeed fortunate.

These early staff members' experience represented
several areas of competence: higher education administrative services, policy making, teaching, communication and media, the development of learning materials, public information, international programs, personnel recruitment and policies, finance and management, and computer programming.

The resulting staff pattern, or roster, included these positions:

- Acting Director (later entitled President)
- Assistant to the President
- Vice-President for Academic Affairs
- Assistant to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs
- Director of Admissions, Records, and Financial Aids
- Director of Business Affairs
- Public Relations Associate
- Educational Communications Associates (5)
- Accountant
- Purchasing Agent

Those who were transferred to the new enterprise had a primary area of responsibility, along with one or more secondary areas of responsibility. Staff members worked wherever it was that a job had to be accomplished. In so doing, the original clear lines designating professional, clerical, and technical staff became blurred. Only the secretarial functions remained clearly designated. Because titles, budgetary and functional, and assignments
frequently changed during the frenetic pace of the opening days, there appears to be no clear record which identifies each of these changes which trailed individual staff members' functional mobility in carrying out his responsibilities.

One could ask if this flexible, somewhat free-wheeling arrangement worked, and the answer would be "yes". It worked, thanks to the staff's commitment to the whole idea, their willingness to jump from one responsibility to another, their ability to work long, long hours on a daily basis, and to the expanding fiscal resources made available to the College. When staff members were being interviewed they were told, in essence, "don't come unless you are willing to give two years of your life to help get this College off the ground."

At this same time, during the Summer of 1971, the Acting Director (President) requested the SUNY Chancellor to seek the necessary approval from the State's Division of Budget to establish 30 new faculty positions. (Note 20) The approval was given and the hiring of faculty members began at an intensive pace.

Staff recruitment. The first recruiting of faculty and administrators was done at a time when higher education was experiencing its first severe job scarcity in many years.
The nature of the new institution attracted applications from excellent teachers and scholars, many of whom felt that traditional ways of imparting knowledge required substantial revision. The College needed and recruited persons of special talent for the role of Mentor. The President and Vice-President for Academic Affairs decided that high academic standards had to be set, and that these standards were to be diligently followed. The small core of full-time Mentors to be hired should, therefore, be academically trained and experienced college and university faculty members. Further, the faculty had to be highly qualified in program planning and in the advising of students on the design of individualized study programs. Strong academic training in a discipline was considered essential, as well as proven teaching ability.

Because of the important need to judge exactly the number of students who would be studying in particular fields, and because of the College's rolling admissions plan, additional part-time adjunct faculty would complete the original Empire State faculty; they would have particular expertise and be drawn widely from the community-at-large. (Note 39, p.23)

Professional staff. In order to accommodate the particular nature of the Empire State academic program and the students
it attracted, faculty would be recruited who could
demonstrate several specific qualities:

1. Competency in relevant scholarship or research;
2. Intellectual rigor in performance;
3. Productive competence in problem solving in research or professional activities;
4. Creative activities in the arts, in public policy development in community service, or other work experience;
5. Excellence in motivating others to learn;
6. Integrity of commitment to perceived values; and
7. Personal security to face risks of the unknown and change with some degree of self-esteem.

(SUNY, Note 50, p.21)

While the first five of these qualities are sought when other colleges hire faculty, it seemed especially important to search for these qualities when hiring for Empire State. The College had to build its reputation quickly; and from the outset, it had to assure itself and the University of a quality academic program. Also, because multiple teaching methods were to be employed at this college without classrooms, faculty had to be resourceful enough to find appropriate learning materials for each student. The nature of the challenge of teaching older, strongly motivated students was also different from
of 30 FTE students, not the 14 or so they were probably accustomed to having. Faculty members would be on 12 month contracts, with one month vacations. In compensation for the longer work year, salaries would be adjusted upward accordingly from current SUNY faculty salary ranges. Faculty would not only teach and serve on the usual institutional type committees, they would also participate in the development of the needed learning resources and in the effort to establish a governance system appropriate for this particular kind of institution.

During the first few months of operation, hundreds of individuals sent their resumes in application for positions at the new College. There being no established personnel or academic departments, the records and arrangements pertaining to hiring fell to an Assistant to the President. The paper work and arrangement making took an extraordinary amount of time as the miniature College staff was attempting to hire 30 faculty in three to four months. At the same time, students were being accepted each week for the first Orientation Workshop which was to be held in October in Albany.

Several months later, a personnel information and procedural system was established. The system consisted of punched cards and form letters. Previous to this, each inquiry was acknowledged and followed up individually as a
file was established for each applicant. The card system was a far more efficient way to keep track of the information needed on each applicant: geographic location preference, highest degree held, salary expectations, type position(s) being applied for, academic areas of training and experience, personal data, the time when the individual would be available to work and if on a full or part-time basis, interview schedules, and application status.

In contrast to usual hiring procedures elsewhere, candidates for faculty or Mentor positions were asked to design and submit sample learning contracts for two mythical students. Information concerning these students' background and educational goals was supplied by the College. This effort acquainted prospective faculty members with the nature of Empire State's students and it required them to project possible teaching methods and resources for each student.

The practice of requesting these sample learning contracts was abandoned in the Spring of 1972. After reading numerous sample contracts, the Deans, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, and the President felt that the procedure did not, in fact, illustrate the nature of spontaneous responses which would be needed when actually working with students.
During interviews, prospective Mentors were questioned closely concerning their views on education and teaching. Those who had a distinct preference for the lecture or classroom modes of teaching, those who were deeply involved in preparing a manuscript or laboratory work, or those who felt that the hours to be spent in individual student contact at Empire State would be excessive, were not hired. (Note 39, p.24) The new College would take exceptional commitment during its developing stage, and applicants were expected to share that commitment with others already employed.

The following Fall (November 1972), in an attempt to further smooth procedures and yet assure the College a quality faculty, the President issued a statement concerning screening and recruiting procedures. The steps included:

1. Receipt and review of names, curriculum vitae, and accompanying references.

2. Request for credentials and further references.

3. Inquiry to determine the candidate's interest and possible availability. The position would be described, general salary range mentioned, and a packet of College materials transmitted.

4. Key informal contacts by the President, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, or Dean for
in-depth reference.

5. Interviews at the Learning and Coordinating Centers.

6. Academic recommendations were to be sent to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, and administrative recommendations to the Executive Vice-President. After review, recommendations were transmitted to the President for his decision.

7. Affirmation of an established budget line, title, and salary.

8. Appointment decision and letter of offer sent. (Note 21)

These procedures were virtually identical to those in operation throughout the SUNY system. The only differences may have been the level of the President's involvement, and the designated need for interviewing in more than one geographic location--at the Coordinating and Learning Center where the faculty member would be working.

During the summer of 1973, the first comprehensive procedural statement on recruitment was issued by the Executive Vice-President. (Note 48) The statement clearly set forth University and College policy for equal employment opportunity, methods of handling inquiries, the posting of vacancies, master file maintenance, role and make-up of screening panels, vitae review, identifying individuals
for interview, obtaining and handling written references, credential checking, the actual interview process, record keeping, entering information into the computer, reporting information regarding recruitment activities, and the actual appointment process. Sample interview comment sheets and schedules were developed to ease the task of handling the information; guidelines for determining comparable academic rank were included; and lists of enclosures for each type of mailing were noted to ensure that appropriate materials were sent to each type candidate (academic, non-academic, State or other funded position).

These guidelines detailed procedures in a more definitive way than those in use at other campuses. Because the new staff had little or no personnel training, the Executive Vice-President wanted to do everything possible to have procedures clearly written and widely disseminated. He wanted to avoid uneven attention to hiring details, which were numerous in a bureaucratic organization. There were also University policies to honor during the process.

It was at this time that the College adopted an established reporting system which would be used for the purposes of compliance with affirmative action regulations and with information requested for SUNY institutional research reports.
Though record keeping for the professional recruitment process presented a considerable amount of detail and paper work, establishing and carrying out the actual interview schedules presented an even larger problem. There were no chauffeurs to drive applicants to and from train stations and the airport, 30 miles away. Also, due to extensive meeting and travel schedules of the few existing staff members and those of the numerous candidates, the task of meshing calendars became formidable.

There were other complicating factors. In some cases, students were ready to begin studying sooner than it was possible to recruit and hire faculty members. Office space had to be found and leased. The College hiring process was a continuous one throughout the calendar year; therefore, most appointments weren't made in the conventional cycle of academic hiring which took place in the Spring months.

There were also problems in getting new personnel paid on time. If all the paper work had been properly completed and appropriately processed, it often took eight to ten weeks to get a pay check to new staff members. The payroll process was handled by the SUNY Central Administration's staff in Albany, and so all records had to be mailed back and forth, or sent via special courier. In time, with clearly stated procedures and more experienced staff, the
process fell into place in normal fashion. Two years later, the payroll record keeping function was transferred to the Coordinating Center, though checks were still issued in Albany by the State.

The recruiting and hiring process was again strengthened in 1974 by the posting on all SUNY campuses a description of each available State funded position. A more widespread publication of vacancies was also made via professional journals and newspapers. (Note 42, p.46)

In the latter months of 1974, the professional recruitment and hiring process remained intact. The only change, really, was the greater involvement of Learning Center personnel in the identifying, screening, interviewing, and recommendation of candidates for positions at their own Centers. Originally, candidates had been interviewed only at the Coordinating Center. This change seemed appropriate.

Clerical and technical staff. As with the vacancies for professional staff members who were to be hired on State budget lines, copies of vacancy notices for support positions would be widely disseminated throughout the SUNY system and, in some instances, in other State departments. Applicants would be canvassed, examined, hired, or transferred via the established Civil Service rules or regulations and procedures. There was little room for procedural
flexibility when hiring Civil Service personnel.

Personnel policies occupied a great deal of time during 1973. Considerable progress was made, resulting in a sharper and clearer description of the Mentor role and the articulation of criteria for appointment, reappointment, and promotion of Mentors. Non-teaching professional job descriptions were also clarified and narrowed considerably; fewer people were then performing three or four functions simultaneously.

The Mentor role. As noted earlier, Empire State College faculty members would be hired not only according to the traditional criteria appropriate to scholarship and teaching, but also against the special criteria which related to the unique nature of this particular College's learning processes. Furthermore, each full-time faculty member would be carrying a 30 FTE student load on a 12 month calendar. Faculty would have functional titles of Mentor. As regular faculty members of the State University of New York, they would have academic rank, responsibilities, and benefits in the same manner as their SUNY colleagues. At Empire State, though, academic titles would be used only for assigning budget lines and to determine salary ranges.

Regular full-time faculty members would have several functions, all of which remained part of the definition of
an Empire State College Mentor: (Note 8, p.8)

1. To counsel and advise students as they plan their learning programs;
2. To design learning programs and contracts;
3. To offer appropriate instruction;
4. To assess and evaluate students' prior learning as it related to current degree goals; and
5. To be knowledgeable about, manage, and develop needed instructional materials and resources.

The Mentor played a significant role in helping students articulate their educational plans or goals and in working with them to implement these plans. They carried major responsibility for the assurance of academic rigor and standards. In a related, vital area, Mentors also participated in the development of the College; in forming academic policy, the development and evaluation of new teaching and institutional techniques and arrangements, short and long-range planning, and the evaluation of personnel for purposes of appointment, reappointment, promotion, and the granting of continuing appointment status. They also identified and evaluated tutors, field supervisors, and adjunct-community faculty who worked with students. (Note 8, p.7)
Part-time, temporary faculty. Part-time or temporary faculty members would be drawn from SUNY, other academic institutions, and from the community-at-large, depending on the areas of competence needed in fulfilling the stated educational goals noted in students' learning contracts. As at other colleges, compensation for part-time or temporary faculty members would be made on an overload or extra-compensation basis, or on released-time schedules arranged by the institutions involved. Qualified outside non-academic professionals would be eligible for faculty appointments, especially in experiential settings where qualified supervisors were able to evaluate the learning which had actually taken place in that setting.

It was anticipated that some tutorial or supervisory work would be carried out on a gratis basis, or in exchange for other educational services. In some cases, the College would offer learning opportunities to employees of a firm or agency in exchange for office space or supervisory services for other Empire State students. This arrangement for educational services was not generally used by other SUNY colleges, where learning took place on campus.

Part-time or temporary faculty would be given functional titles of part-time Mentor, adjunct faculty members, or tutor, depending on the nature of the assignment and length of the term applicable to that assignment.
These adjunct or community faculty would be drawn from community colleges, industry, labor, government, community service groups and agencies, churches, para-professional fields, banking, business, and the arts. They would serve on panels or committees assisting in the evaluation of prior learning, help students choose career fields, and work with ways the Learning Center could relate to the community. (Note 33, p.33)

**Visiting faculty.** The College was obligated to experiment with and to deliver diverse kinds of learning resources. Given the heavy teaching load of Mentors, it was realized that few of them would be able to take time to develop these types and quantities of materials on an immediate basis. Therefore, the College looked to other institutions for visiting faculty members.

During the first year of operation, several faculty members from SUNY and elsewhere affiliated with the College on a visiting basis for periods of three months to one year, generally to assist in the development of learning resources and to review existing resources as they might pertain to Empire State student needs. Others participated as tutors in relation to a specific student's learning contract, or they served on faculty advisory committees or academic task forces. (Note 40, p.8) These flexible
employment practices allowed the College to serve student's resources, program, or counseling needs without being locked into longer term employment contracts, especially in areas where it was difficult, if not impossible, to project the precise academic area, volume, duration, and geographic location of such needs.

The visiting faculty would work out of the Coordinating Center. During 1971-72, eleven visiting faculty members began the development of learning resources. The following year, another eleven were brought in to work on these projects. (Note 39, pp.32-33) Later 12, Empire State Mentors were reassigned for varying periods of time to work with the visiting faculty members. The visiting faculty also conducted experiments with several media, mainly audio and video tape. A series of TV discussions was also undertaken in cooperation with the area's educational TV channel. (ESC, Note 40, p.8) By the end of June 1973, over 150 learning modules were commissioned and 63 had been completed.

This arrangement presented a problem: because Empire State Mentors had not been involved originally with the development or review of those materials which were being prepared for their use, they were unfamiliar with their contents and potential use. They were, understandably, reluctant to use them. Ways were found to remedy this
situation. Faculty-student workshops were held, using the materials. Members of the visiting faculty went to Learning Centers to help Mentors become familiar with their contents and ways to utilize them.

During the following year (in 1973-74) Empire State faculty members were more deeply involved in the development and review of the new learning materials. They tested modules and assisted in the preparation of others, utilizing visiting faculty members as tutors and group discussion leaders at their Learning Centers. As a result, more of these resources were used by the Mentors in their work with students.

The non-teaching professional. The non-teaching professional role at Empire State was originally designed to fulfill varied supportive roles to the academic program. The nature of those roles remained constant through the period being examined. They performed in areas similar to those in other colleges: admissions, general administration, personnel, public information, institutional research, program evaluation, administrative services, and student services. Uncommon areas were: the assessment of prior learning, learning resource development and publication, and liaison with library personnel in public and private libraries across the State.
They served at several levels of employment: as assistant or associate deans, administrative associates, academic counselors, or special program directors. Some also performed as tutors and Mentors. (ESC, Note 42, p.44)

Non-teaching professionals often performed in multiple areas of responsibility and their roles were redefined in the broadest of terms. Wide use of detailed job descriptions and employee performance evaluations were not regularized until after the time of accreditation in December 1974.

Staff characteristics. A study of Mentor and Dean characteristics was conducted on the 62 Mentors and Deans who were employed as of May 1, 1973. (Note 2) Ages ranged from 24 - 69, with an average age of 40.6 years. Forty-three of the 62 Mentors and Deans were men. Most of these surveyed were born in the Northeast; many had traveled extensively throughout this and other countries. Thirty-five held terminal degrees, and another 17 were degree candidates. More than half of them had a minimum of five years of college-level teaching, and 50 of them had published.

In an August 1974 sampling of 166 full and part-time faculty, (Note 16) the findings revealed virtually the same statistics: average age was 40; ages ranged from 21 - 70;
76 held terminal degrees, and about one-third of the faculty were women ... a better than average showing for U.S. colleges.

Seventy-eight professional staff members, whose primary function was administrative, were also included in that 1974 survey. The reported characteristics revealed the following statistics, with women again in a high percentile:

- Males: 43
- Females: 35
- Average age: 37
- Age range: 21 - 52
- Terminal degree: 26

In that same survey, 87 classified or Civil Service members were included: 10 males and 77 females. Their average age was 30. Their ages ranged from 18-62. Eleven had associate or bachelor degrees. As might be expected with support staff characteristics, none held a master or doctoral degree.

**Staff size.** In July 1971, the early planning staff consisted of 15 administrators and slightly fewer secretarial-technical staff members. A year later, 25 faculty members had been hired (excepting the visiting faculty members); the administrative staff totaled 22; and the support staff
consisted of about 20 persons.

By the end of June 1973, with 1,420 students enrolled, (Note 41) the staffing picture again changed: 64 faculty, 42 administrative, and 60 support staff members.

A year later, at the end of August 1974, there was an overall student enrollment of 1,679, (Note 11) with 166 faculty, 76 administrative, and 87 secretarial-clerical staff members. (Note 16) (Appendix Q contains an organizational chart for the College at that time.)

**Professional development.** The College's early plans included provision for professional and career development opportunities for its entire staff: academic, non-academic or non-teaching, and support staff. In direct terms, the 1972 Master Plan stated:

Empire State College must provide for the identification of potential faculty and for their professional growth. The broad competencies necessary to fulfill the responsibilities of Empire State College faculty members, whether full-time Mentors, part-time adjunct or community faculty, or participating non-teaching professionals, are not encompassed in the usual preparation of any single academic professional . . . During the next four years, as time and resources become more available, . . . in-service training activities will become more systematic. (Note 33, p.35)

The document continued to describe the intensity of a Mentor-student relationship, of the resulting demands on one's intellectual capacities when Mentors are required to meet wide ranges of students' academic interests. Such
pressures create a situation of continuing intellectual stretching or growth. The fact that students' Learning Contracts can begin and end on any determined date, means that there was no clearly designated free time for a Mentor to catch up or focus energies on his own professional interests.

The College, therefore, proposed the State University of New York a professional development plan, composed of options to the traditional sabbatical leave:

1. After four consecutive years, a four-month leave with full pay; and
2. After two consecutive years, a four-month leave at half pay, or a two-month leave at full pay.

Additional leave time without pay could be arranged for Mentors needing extra time, if the Learning Center workload could be rearranged to accommodate such needs. The Learning Centers were still to be open year-round and to demonstrate ability to handle the range of student needs.

The College also sought relief of the unusually heavy administrative responsibilities for the Mentors. The individualized Learning Contract mode proved to require a great deal of secretarial support and record keeping. Each student had several learning contracts, as well as their
evaluations. Copies for the student's permanent file, the Mentor, Associate Dean at the Center, and for the student had to be prepared, typewritten, and signed by all parties. Consequently, the College administration sought approval for a different funding pattern for support staff: one secretary for each three Mentors. The budget request was denied, leaving Mentors to do much of their own typing and record keeping.

Included in this proposal to SUNY was also the creation of professional development time for members of the non-teaching staff. This part of the proposal was accepted by the University. Empire State faculty and non-teaching professionals began to apply for, and to receive, released time for their approved professional development programs. Staff members could design their own program, or they could participate in an extensive career development program sponsored by the New York State Civil Service. The Civil Service programs were open to both professional and support staff members.

Throughout the three years under review, several staff members took advantage of long and short-term educational opportunities: books, articles, and dissertations were completed, papers were presented at national and international gatherings, learning modules and other types of learning resources were developed, and skills were
upgraded.

**Workload.** The workload was considered by all to be very heavy. Ways were found to vary the Mentors workload, because as noted earlier, compared to other SUNY faculty, Empire State's budgeted faculty workloads were heavier and their work terms longer. Furthermore, the paper work and other administrative aspects of their jobs were more numerous than that of their colleagues at traditional educational institutions. At the same time, one must acknowledge that their salaries were also higher.

In the Fall of 1974, the burden of keeping the student's permanent records shifted from the Learning Centers to the Coordinating Center. Though such a move reduced the amount of time that a Mentor had to spend filing, other aspects of administrative details were kept at the Learning Center. It was expected that when the computerized academic information program was operative, some of the workload might again be made lighter.

As funds became tighter, the number of support staff could no longer be expanded, though the Legislature did fund academic budget lines. More faculty were hired. Faculty took on more of the preparation of academic documents, again in order not to penalize the student by administrative delays.
Faculty were heavily involved in each student's orientation and study, in the identification and evaluation of learning resources, and in reviewing academic work throughout each student's degree program.

Locally, faculty members served on several kinds of committees: academic review; assessment of prior learning; recruitment, hiring, and evaluation of other faculty and staff; and College governance. Institutionally, they were engaged in task forces and committees looking at similar areas on a college-wide basis. They also participated in special committees which examined the needs of a new and different kind of college, one established without a great deal of planning time.

To ease the workload and to encourage student-peer interaction, faculty members began to utilize the seminar and group study modes of learning. Group studies consisted of occasional meetings to assist students in the preparation of their portfolios of prior learning, strengthen their writing skills, and to study specific academic topics, e.g., the dance, women's studies, labor union contract negotiating.

From these efforts emerged a program of residencies of varying lengths of time, from one day to three weeks. Residencies were generally sponsored by and held at Learning Centers. If they were held for a period longer than one
day, other institutions' campus or motel facilities were sometimes used. Residencies were open to all Empire State students as components of their learning contracts.

In 1972, official office hours at the Learning Centers were reduced to a five day a week schedule: 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Though Mentors were still seeing students at other hours, and perhaps in other locations, students were no longer utilizing Learning Center facilities during evenings and weekend periods. Further, it was becoming difficult to find support staff members who were willing or able to work during customary off-hours.

Then in September 1973, the Executive Vice-President announced the inauguration of the practice of No Appointment Weeks. To partially compensate for traditional holiday breaks in the academic calendar, four times during the calendar year one week periods would be set aside "to allow faculty an opportunity to assemble and review student work and records and attend to matters which cannot usually be accomplished during a more normal schedule." (Note 7) There were to be no appointments with students or academic meetings during these specified periods. The purpose of this plan was partially realized. The only violation of the new policy was that meetings were held by committees of the College's governance mechanism and by other groups with administrative concerns. In effect, then,
the No Appointment Weeks did help to ease the 30 - 1 faculty student ratio.

Faculty members at Empire State did not receive customary summer, Thanksgiving, Christmas, and Easter or Spring vacations. Instead, they received the 12 legal State holidays, a one-month vacation, and four No Appointment Weeks.

Subsequently, in 1974, four weeks in August were designated as a faculty reading period for the enhancement of faculty members' own professional growth. This August Reading Period was in place for all faculty members in addition to the other professional development opportunities mentioned earlier. Non-teaching professional and support staff members were not able to participate in the No Appointment Weeks or the August Reading Period. They were able to take vacation and leave at any time convenient to their supervisors and when the workload permitted.

Mentors often found it difficult to take advantage of their professional development opportunities, because no extra Mentors were available to absorb their teaching load while they would be on leave. Further, because it was difficult to break into a student's learning contract to turn him over to another Mentor or tutor for the period of time he would be on leave.

With the exception of a minimum number of administrative problems in implementing the plan for students already
under contract for the period, the plan's objectives were met. The August Reading Period and the No Appointment Weeks remain in the College calendar.

The emerging concept of a Mentor. As a result of the role in which faculty performed at Empire State College, the Mentor concept emerged. A Fall 1973 survey revealed information on who Mentors were: their backgrounds, reasons for coming to the College, their functions and activities.

Empire State College full-time Mentor's average age was 40, with two-thirds of them over age 35. According to Medsker, this age level is high for those teaching in an individualized setting. Thirty-three percent were female, a figure seven percent higher than national figures Bayer reported in 1970. Mentors reported an average load of 17 full-time and 13 part-time students. When asked about employment history, the results showed that the average Mentor worked 2.6 years at Empire State, 3.9 years in other colleges and universities, 1.8 years in other educational-related endeavors, and 4.5 years in other kinds of employment. Thirty-five percent had experience in college administration, 15 percent held non-teaching research positions in universities, and 12 percent taught previously in non-traditional programs. Fifty-nine percent had their doctorate or equivalent, which is again
"higher than the national average for faculty at four year colleges. (Bayer 1970). Overall, the Mentors appeared fairly typical of most college faculties and as such fairly uncommon for faculty in other individualized settings (Medsker, et al, 1975.)" (Note 8, p.3)

Mentors came to Empire State primarily because it offered students and faculty a flexible program and because faculty were given the opportunity to work very closely with students and to try new approaches to learning. Mentor responses clearly indicated an apparent commitment to flexible, interdisciplinary, individualized education for adults, rather than to scholarship and the training of scholars.

There was no "typical day" for a Mentor. Faculty and committee meetings tended to group on particular days, because the College calendar attempted to indicate certain days for meetings. Another reason is that individuals work differently: some took care of their paper work and/or professional development on one or two days a week, while others spread out those activities. However, if one were pressed to describe a "typical day" in the life of a Mentor, it might be: four hours of student contact, one hour or more for paper work such as completing forms, writing contracts, programs of study (degree program), contract digests and evaluations, etc; one hour for College committee
assignments; one hour of telephone contact with students or other related to student work; and one to three hours would be spent on group studies, Learning Center committee meetings, and/or contacts outside the Center . . . a minimum of eight hours. (Note 8, p.5)

Consequently, the Mentor's role remains both to provide a rigorous academic context for students to learn and to encourage them to become active participants in that learning process. The ability to effect this process requires that Mentors know the key elements of the learning process. The Mentor must also ensure that students are developing critical faculties, establishing the ability to learn in other contexts, and aiding the student to become an independent learner. (Note 8, p.6)

**Summary**

As one would expect, the College operated smoothly under the personnel policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees; this was a given, due to the fact that the policies are comprehensive, and because all colleges within the SUNY system have to conform to these policies. With regard to procedures and staffing patterns, there were differences between those planned and those realized. Planning time was eclipsed: there were only three months between the time when Chancellor Boyer presented the concept to his
staff and when the SUNY Board and the Governor approved the plan. A month later founding grants were announced, and five months after that the College was open and operating. With such a time schedule, it was understandable that plans would not be carried out exactly as envisioned.

Realities of living in a world with diminishing fiscal resources and trying at the same time to expand educational opportunities had to be taken into account, as appointments were made and resources allocated. When one path of approval seemed blocked, creativity and perserverance were needed to discover other ways and means to carry out the College's mission.

Empire State College's faculty and staff were deeply involved in multiple aspects of the College's formation. In addition to their more familiar responsibilities on an established campus, faculty had longer terms of appointment and heavier-than-usual workloads. The College successfully experimented with different kinds of professional leaves which did, in fact, reduce the continuing intense pace of involvement.

Being part of the State University of New York was viewed as a mixed blessing. Experimenting with personnel policies and procedures within a public, bureaucratic educational system was often difficult. Having access to the resources of New York State, though, relieved the
President of many kinds of pressures to find operating funds, in contrast to his colleagues in private institutions. At the same time, the College could tap into other education resources which were available throughout the SUNY system. In time, a durable concept of a Mentor and his role emerged, and individualized learning was more widely accepted.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS

Introductory Statement

The purpose of this study has been to inquire into some effects of the implementation of the Empire State College mission on selected administrative practices. The study traces the historical development of administrative practice in four areas—Learning Center organization and operation, admissions and enrollment, academic record keeping, personnel and staffing—noting both elements that were from the outset at variance with conventional practice and subsequent changes in administrative structure after the College was underway.

The purpose was to determine what differences from conventional administrative practice were essential to the implementation of the Empire State College mission. Contrary to expectation and the original research design, the findings of this study are not a series of discrete mission-related departures from conventional practice; rather, they are separately and collectively manifestations of necessary conditions and attributes underlying the evolution of effective administration.
By design, Empire State College was intended to take on characteristics that differed from those of its sister institutions in the State University of New York system. A different student clientele would be served. The College would seek out the student not being served by other SUNY institutions, e.g., adults with working or home responsibilities, the placebound, persons wanting to participate in the planning of their own educational program.

The College would be located at various sites across New York State. Carrying out SUNY aims, learning opportunities were to be within commuting distance of every interested and qualified student. No citizen was to be denied access to higher learning because of his geographic location. Empire State College would have core faculty groups in several regions of the State, with smaller groups of faculty at multiple outposts of each regional center.

Different teaching and learning modes would be developed, tested, and delivered or utilized. The College was to demonstrate that valid learning could take place outside the classroom, and that learning could be documented and applied to degree requirements approved by the University and State Education Department.

The College would operate on a calendar year. Each student would be able to study at his own pace and not be locked into semester, quarter, or tri-semester time frames.
Students would be allowed to step in and out of their study program when other responsibilities demanded it.

The institution would be a non-traditional college, with no academic departments and customary campus facilities. Students would meet their Mentors at mutually convenient times and places. Faculty offices would be in the Learning Center or Unit. The planned breadth of the geographic dispersement of Learning Centers and Units, as well as the size of the anticipated number of enrolled students at each site, would preclude the necessity for academic departments. Faculty in a particular discipline wishing to share their own research findings or experiences were free to do so with their colleagues at other nearby institutions or at the College's semi-annual all-college meetings. There was no need for residence and dining halls for students who were studying in their own homes as they continued their regular work and home responsibilities.

Empire State College would be funded on fiscal formulas differing from those used for other SUNY Colleges. There would be no capital budget for Empire State College. Because groups of students would not be taught the same thing in a classroom setting, but on a one-to-one basis, different fiscal formulas and support staff patterns would be needed. Because the College's faculty and students were so
physically dispersed, larger-than-usual travel and communications budgets would be required. However, the anticipated figures were expected to be less per full-time student than the combined instruction and capital costs per student elsewhere in the State University system.

What the founding fathers stated as assumptions are now realities. Empire State College is an accredited college, serving over 3400 students in a learning environment of the configuration envisioned in the original design.

**Conclusions**

On the basis of an analysis of the historical development of four areas of the administrative structure of Empire State College, the researcher concluded that success in establishing a college pursuing a mission such as that prescribed by the planners of Empire State College is dependent on three conditions:

1. There has to be a large measure of freedom from systemic constraint.
2. Decision makers must be capable of proceeding on the basis of intuitive judgments, yet self-critical and resolute enough to change course whenever necessary.
3. The entire staff must possess the energy and commitment to undergo continuous modification
of administrative practice.

Discussion. The need for freedom from systemic constraint becomes self-evident once divergent purpose (as in the case of Empire State College) is pitted against the convergent nature of systems. One of the major benefits of centralized educational systems is collective wisdom, the capacity to make projections that are based on a mode of multiple institutional experience. Such generalizations are, however, useful only for re-creation or perpetuation of the modal ethos of the system's parts.

The accumulated experience within a multi-campus system can establish with a fair degree of reliability an effective staffing pattern for conducting the business of any segment of the system, so long as that segment does not differ in significant ways from its counterparts in the system. Similarly, the apparatus for monitoring admissions, enrollments, and records can be standardized--and for systemic efficiency it usually is--for processing conventional students in conventional ways. So it is with building and maintaining physical plants, recruiting faculty, and a host of other activities.

If, however, one segment differs in mission from the others in a system, to the extent that function (mission) affects form (conventional structures and procedures), the
usefulness of systemic wisdom is called into question. Ergo, the need for freedom to proceed in different fashion once experience has demonstrated the need for altering course.

To be sure, those who pilot a new type of institution through uncharted seas must do so in conscious ignorance. How well conventional knowledge applies under unconventional circumstances is moot. The pilot moves forward intuitively, with neither concrete nor formal operational control; consequently, the decision makers must be able to live with the small comfort of intuitive judgment. They are committed to trial-and-error, an activity that has error as a not unlikely possible outcome. Error simply goes with the territory, and decision makers must be resolute enough to persist in their intuitive judgments and flexible (and humble) enough to change course whenever they find their judgments in error.

To do so demands a high energy level and unflagging commitment, not only among top-level decision makers, but throughout the entire staff. Because the staff must carry much of the burden of executing changes in direction, they need to share in understanding of and commitment to mission; they need also to possess high energy and be fully apprised of the likely incidence of error. In the absence of these, staff members are bound to charge the
ambiguities of continuous change to the incompetence of leadership, with counter-productive results.

**Findings**

An inquiry into the impact of mission on administrative practice, of course, is pointless in the absence of institutional viability. That Empire State College is indeed a viable institution adhering to its intended mission has been established by means external to this study—by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. To make the institution viable required, as experience proved, intuitive judgments as regards the appropriateness of administrative structure and procedures; flexibility in developing alternative arrangements wherever and whenever the need became evident; and an unlimited outpour of energy, reinforced by commitment to the avowed mission. These requisites have been documented in the findings related to the four areas under surveillance, viz., Learning Center organization and operation, admissions and enrollment, academic record keeping, and personnel and staffing.

**Learning Center organization and operation.** The original purpose of establishing a network of Learning Centers was to provide access to students not being served by the State University of New York campuses. As external or State
funding became available, the College was able to open Learning Centers across the State. Centers had different sources of funding and, therefore, faculty and student bodies of differing sizes; some Centers had a special program focus which further differentiated them. At the end of the period under review, there was evidence that Empire State College was serving students not usually found enrolled in traditional academic programs on SUNY campuses.

Admissions and enrollment. The admission and enrollment process as originally set forth had several purposes:

1. To acquaint the student with the educational modes used by the College;

2. To orient the student to the administrative process which supported his academic program, to acquaint him with his responsibilities for initiating processes, and his need for retaining copies of all documents;

3. The need to familiarize Learning Center staff members with prospective students, their interests, and academic needs.

The comprehensive admissions application assisted the College with basic information about the student, as well as provided the College with data desired for research purposes.
With experience, the process and forms were altered, streamlined and modified. The duration of the Orientation Workshops was shortened, after the emergence of descriptive materials which explained the College and its program to applicants. Staff members became more familiar with basic student needs and ways in which the College could accommodate them. The College was thereby provided the experience needed upon which to modify the originally planned process without serious disruption.

Word about the College spread quickly and without much publicity from the institution itself. Very few recruiting efforts were necessary. In fact, there was generally a sufficient backlog of processed applicants awaiting the College's ability to admit them.

**Academic record keeping.** This area of the study turned out to be one which illustrates ways in which planned systems can develop from a loosely organized guideline into a tightly organized, computerized system. Permanent records were originally kept at both the Learning Center and at the Coordinating Center. Producing a transcript was a time-consuming procedure. Evaluations of student work had to be located, retyped, and reproduced. With the establishment of a Records Center, particular documents were specified as part of the official College transcript;
the original copy of each was to be permanently filed with the Registrar in the Records Center. Computerization of the record keeping process assisted in the location of information, provided the means for rapid retrieval of all data on a student from inquiry through graduation, and enabled the College to store hard cover files quickly. The result was considered by visiting observers to be a most complete, yet flexible, computerized academic record keeping system.

**Personnel and staffing.** The Empire State College mission required that faculty function as Mentors rather than as Professors. There appears to have been no shortage of qualified applicants. Frank and comprehensive job descriptions, coupled with careful screening, led to a high success rate among those selected. Additionally, the recruitment of a large number of part-time Mentors proved to be academically and administratively feasible. In time, it was necessary to provide professional development opportunities differing in kind and frequency from those at conventional SUNY campuses.

There is evidence to support the contention that the earlier appointment of a vice-president for administration could have lent greater support and coordination to the implementation of a sophisticated administrative structure.
In the examination of experimental colleges, each college has its own characteristics . . . Empire State College is no exception. Again and again throughout the period and process of this study, the evidence revealed that in order to have a successful program, the elements in the study's three conclusions were needed: freedom from systemic constraints; self-critical and resolute decision makers, capable of making appropriate intuitive judgments; and a devoted and energetic enough staff, able to adapt to changing administrative practices.
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TASK FORCE CREATED TO STUDY WAYS IN WHICH THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK MIGHT MEET HIGHER EDUCATIONAL NEEDS IN NEW YORK STATE

Boyer, Ernest L. 

Christianson, Gordon

Ertell, Merton W.

Hali, James W.

Mather, John

Spencer, Robert W. 

Chancellor

University Dean for Educational Development

Deputy Vice-Chancellor

Assistant Vice-Chancellor for Policy and Planning

Deputy Assistant to the Chancellor

Director of Long Range Planning
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CONSULTANTS TO THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
TO APPRAISE STAGING PLANS

Hon. Stephen K. Bailey
Syracuse University Research Corporation
Syracuse University

Dr. Arthur W. Chickering
Office of Research
American Council on Education

Mr. Theodore R. Conant
CBS Laboratories

Dean John C. Crandall
Associate Dean for the Faculty
of the Social Sciences
State University College at Brockport

Dr. Calvin Lee
Vice President
Boston University

Dean Walter Lowen
School of Advanced Technology
State University of New York at Binghamton

Dr. Warren B. Martin
Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

Dr. Marshall Robinson
Program Officer for Higher Education
The Ford Foundation

Professor Allen D. Sapp
Director and Master of the Colleges
State University of New York at Buffalo
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CAMPUSES OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

UNIVERSITY CENTERS

State University at Albany
State University at Binghamton
State University at Buffalo
State University at Stony Brook

MEDICAL CENTERS

Downstate Medical Center at Brooklyn
Upstate Medical Center at Syracuse

COLLEGES OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

College at Prockport
College at Buffalo
College at Cortland
College at Fredonia
College at New Paltz
College at Old Westbury

College at Oneonta
College at Oswego
College at Plattsburgh
College at Purchase
Empire State College
Upper Division College

SPECIALIZED COLLEGES

College of Forestry at Syracuse University
Maritime College at Fort Schuyler (Bronx)

AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES (Two-Year)

Alfred
Canton
Cobleskill

Delhi
Farmingdale
Morrisville

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Adirondack Community College at Glens Falls
Auburn Community College at Auburn
Borough of Manhattan Community College
Bronx Community College
Broome Technical Community College at Binghamton
Clinton Community College at Plattsburgh
Columbia-Greene Community College at Athens
Community College of the Finger Lakes at Canadagia
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FUNCTIONAL ORGANIZATION
OF
ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER

PRESIDENT

Copyrighes & Legal Affairs

External Relations

Academic Affairs

Program Design

Academic Program

Center Planning & Coordination

Design Faculty

Evaluation & Credentialing

Admissions & Records

Personnel

Business Management

Production Services

Library & Instruction Materials

Distribution Services

Information and Publications
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PROPOSED REGIONAL LEARNING CENTER
ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING

Associate Dean or Director

Coordinator of Academic Advisement Testing, and Scheduling

Clerical

3 Mentors

20 Study Tutors (5 F.E.)

16 Correspondence Tutors (4 F.E.)

Mail Clerk/Typist

Secretary

Coordinator of Educational Resources

Clerical
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EMPIRE STATE COLLEGE LEARNING CENTERS

DECEMBER 1974

Learning Centers

Genesee Valley
    Ithaca
    Rochester

Long Island
    Central Islip
    Clearwater
    Creedmoor
    Hempstead
    Mooney Pond
    Old Westbury

Lower Hudson
    Purchase
    Suffern

Metropolitan New York
    36 Lexington Avenue
    Bedford Stuyvesant
    South Bronx

Niagara Frontier
    Buffalo

Northwest
    Albany

College-Wide Division

Binghamton
    New Paltz
    Plattsburgh
    Saratoga Springs
    Syracuse
    Utica

Special Programs

Labor Center
    Urban Studies
Corning Community College at Corning
Dutchess Community College at Poughkeepsie
Erie Community College at Buffalo
Fashion Institute of Technology at New York City
Fulton-Montgomery Community College at Johnstown
Genesee Community College at Batavia
Herkimer County Community College at Ilion
Hostos Community College at South Bronx
Hudson Valley Community College at Troy
Jamestown Valley Community College at Jamestown
Jefferson Community College at Watertown
Kingsborough Community College
LaGuardia Community College at Long Island City
Mohawk Valley Community College at Utica
Monroe Community College at Rochester
Nassau Community College at Garden City
New York City Community College
Niagara County Community College at Niagara Falls
North Country Community College at Saranac Lake
Onondaga Community College at Syracuse
Orange County Community College at Middletown
Queensborough Community College
Rockland Community College at Suffern
Schenectady County Community College at Schenectady
Staten Island Community College
Suffolk County Community College at Selden
Sullivan County Community College at South Fallsburg
Tompkins-Cortland Community College at Groton
Ulster County Community College at Stone Ridge
Westchester Community College at Valhalla
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PRESS CONFERENCE STATEMENT BY ERNEST L. BOYER,
CHANCELLOR OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
FEBRUARY 16, 1971
State University of New York
NEW NON-RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE

Statement
by
Chancellor Ernest L. Boyer

Press Conference
2 p.m., February 16, 1971
The Governor's Office
22 West 55th Street
New York City
I am pleased to announce, on behalf of the Board of Trustees, the creation of a new non-residential college within the State University of New York. The launching of this institution--a "college without a campus"--has been significantly furthered by the $1,000,000 grant awarded jointly by the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation.

For many reasons, we believe this to be the moment for an entirely new approach to undergraduate education within the State University of New York:

... We are experiencing in the United States a continuing revolution in communications and data processing which enables more people to be in touch more rapidly and in more varied forms than ever before.

... The age of the 747 and the Metroliner have so extended the "campus" that students may now spend their junior year in Paris, their winter recess in research at a distant university, and part of each week teaching in an urban school hundreds of miles from their university.

... We are also observing equally dramatic shifts in human and social development. Today's teenagers are maturing faster than their parents and absorbing knowledge more rapidly. More and more people wish to return to college later in life.
Such developments—and many more—sharply challenge the conventional wisdom of educational planners. Institutions of higher learning are everywhere being forced to re-examine their traditional assumptions about who should go to college and what the length and nature of the college experience ought to be.

State University's new non-residential college has been conceived in response to such questions, and will be geared—in so far as possible—to the actual circumstances of our time.

None of the traditional paraphernalia of college life will be retained simply out of custom or force of habit.

The emphasis will be upon flexibility of format, curriculum, and patterns of study.

But in this new college the essential values of the more traditional approach to learning will not only be encouraged but enhanced. The college will stress clarity of goals, excellence of individual performance, and continuing personal evaluation. In spite of the emphasis upon independent, off-campus study, the student-teacher relationship will be preserved. Interaction may be less frequent, but it will be no less intense. Indeed, faculty members will be able to perform their most important function—that of mentor and guide—freed of the responsibility to provide
factual information through daily classroom lectures.

Finally, a word about the institutional framework of this new college. While it will be a fully autonomous institution, it will draw upon the resources of the sixty-nine State University campuses throughout the state, and use many of them as learning centers. Its prospects are thus immeasurably enhanced as it becomes part of an already flourishing network of learning. It will, in this sense, truly be a "College of the Empire State."

We at State University are intensely excited about this new college. We are grateful for the support received and confident of success.
## Appendix H

**Sample SUNY Admission Application**

### S-1 Application for Admission to SUNY for Undergraduate Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Social Security Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Date of Birth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Sex</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Home Phone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. State or Country</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Zip Code</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Are you a legal resident of NY State?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. County of Residence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. County Code</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**List Colleges in Order of Preference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Curriculum Name</th>
<th>Expected Date to Enter</th>
<th>On or Off Campus</th>
<th>Financial Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. College</td>
<td>1. Curriculum Name</td>
<td>1. Expected Date to Enter</td>
<td>1. On or Off Campus</td>
<td>1. Financial Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. College</td>
<td>2. Curriculum Name</td>
<td>2. Expected Date to Enter</td>
<td>2. On or Off Campus</td>
<td>2. Financial Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. College</td>
<td>3. Curriculum Name</td>
<td>3. Expected Date to Enter</td>
<td>3. On or Off Campus</td>
<td>3. Financial Assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Classification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>23. Student Classification</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High School Last or Currently Attended**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>26. High School Last or Currently Attended</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High School Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>29. High School Activities</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAT Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>24-25. Date Exam Was or Will Be Taken, If Any</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CEEB Code**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>27. CEEB Code</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date of Graduation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>28. Date of Graduation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Dependents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>32. Number of Dependents</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Be sure to review reverse side.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Social Security Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**34 Circle your degree objective**
1. General
2. AA
3. AS
4. AAS
5. AOS
6. BA
7. BS
8. ABD
9. M.Ed
10. M.D

**35 Circle any health problem or physical disability the college should know of if you are admitted**
1. No health problem
2. Heart trouble
3. Blind or partially sighted
4. Deaf or hard of hearing
5. Neurological impairment
6. Speech impediments
7. Other

**36 Name and address of □ Parent □ Guardian □ Spouse □ Other**

---

**TRANSFERS, HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS with college credits, and EEC STUDENTS must complete the following**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>37 Name all colleges attended</th>
<th>38 College Code</th>
<th>39 Street, City, State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**40 Full-time □ Yes □ No**
**41 Part-time □ Yes □ No**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>42 Dates</th>
<th>43 ECP Student</th>
<th>44 GPA Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**45 Total GPA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>46 Brial Credits</th>
<th>47 Credits in progress</th>
<th>48 Credits planned</th>
<th>49 Brial credits expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**50 Curriculum in which you are (were) enrolled**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>51 Previous curriculum code</th>
<th>52 Circle name of degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**53 Date of degree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>54 College at which degree was awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Ask each college previously attended to mail your transcript to the Director of Admissions of the college to which you are applying**

---

**To be completed by secondary school**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank is</th>
<th>in a class of</th>
<th>High school average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Required application fee (made payable to APPLICATION PROCESSING CENTER) should be inserted into the pocket of the envelope provided. DO NOT SEND CASH.**
Mail only to colleges requiring postcards.
(See College Information Chart in the Application Guide)

I am a ☐ Freshman ☐ Transfer applicant to ________________________________

______________________________ MO./YR. ________________________________

______________________________ CURRICULUM NAME ________________________________

I am an EOP applicant ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Veteran ☐ Yes ☐ No

Name ________________________________ Social Security # ___/___/____

Street ________________________________

City ________________________________ State __________ Zip ________

S-3 APPLICANT POSTCARD

Mail only to colleges requiring postcards.
(See College Information Chart in the Application Guide)

I am a ☐ Freshman ☐ Transfer applicant to, ___________________________________

______________________________ MO./YR. ________________________________

______________________________ CURRICULUM NAME ________________________________

I am an EOP applicant ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Veteran ☐ Yes ☐ No

Name ________________________________ Social Security # ___/___/____

Street ________________________________

City ________________________________ State __________ Zip ________

S-3 APPLICANT POSTCARD
APPENDIX I

SAMPLE ESC ADMISSION APPLICATION

These materials introduce you to a new type of education. They describe a major addition to the alternatives for higher education offered by the State University of New York.

Because of its different approach, admission to Empire State College calls for more than a factual review of test scores and past educational accomplishments. The Bulletin describes the educational concepts upon which the college is based, what you can expect to receive from it, and what is expected of you. Education at Empire State begins with the application and Prospectus which asks you to think seriously about your own plans and aspirations, and about how you might use the college to work toward them.

We welcome your application. I assure you that we will take seriously the information and ideas you express.

Arthur Chickering
Vice-President for
Academic Affairs

The information requested on the attached Prospectus is for Empire State College only. It must be completed fully if you wish to be considered as an applicant for admission. Read the Bulletin carefully. Also complete a State University of New York Application Form available from your local High School or by writing to: Admissions Processing Center, 30 Russell Road, Albany, New York 12206. Have your college forward official transcripts (if any) and send the Prospectus to Empire State College, 2 Union Avenue, Saratoga Springs, New York 12866.
EMPIRE STATE COLLEGE, 2 Union Avenue, Saratoga Springs, New York 12866

PROSPECTUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Social Security Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Tel.</th>
<th>A/C</th>
<th>Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(no. -street - (apt.)</td>
<td>Nos.</td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(city state)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A/C</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(county zip code)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUNY Admission Application filed?</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. With which Learning Center would you affiliate?
   - Albany
   - Rochester

2. When would you expect to start your studies?
   Month Year

3. Based on the following definitions do you plan to be a full-time or part-time student?
   - If you plan to be a full-time student you should be able to devote an average of 30 to 40 hours per week to your studies.
   - If you plan to be a part-time student you should be able to devote an average of 15 to 20 hours per week to your studies.

4. How would you evaluate your present educational level?
   - High School Graduate
   - College 1 yr.
   - 2yr.
   - 3 yr.
   - Other
   - Please explain.
   
   ____________________________
5. What other experiences seem to be pertinent to your admission to Empire State College?

6. Why do you want to attend Empire State rather than another college?
7. What are your long range vocational or professional plans or aspirations? In what ways would the fulfillment of these plans affect your life style?
8. What are your current responsibilities and obligations? Which of these would continue as you pursue your program at Empire State College?

9. What area of studies would you like to pursue? Be as specific as you can (according to your own interests, inclinations, talents, career aims, etc.).

10. What kinds of learning resources would you be able to use in your community?
11. What kinds of work experiences or volunteer activities might your program include?

12. What would be the best way for you to confer, at least monthly, with your mentor?

13. In view of your answers above, in what way do you see your experience at Empire State as furthering your personal and professional aims?
14. How might you begin your studies? What sequence of activities might you undertake?
APPENDIX J

SAMPLE ENROLLMENT AGREEMENT

EMPIRE STATE COLLEGE

ENROLLMENT AGREEMENT

I hereby ( ) enroll in Empire State College as ( ) full-time student and authorize the College to consider me enrolled as of ____________ and to bill me in accordance with the policies and procedures of the State University of New York.

I understand that if I will be enrolled continually and that tuition charges will continue until the College Business Office is notified of withdrawal, graduation, or termination by other means. I understand that students are considered enrolled in the College if they have a call on college facilities and services regardless of whether they are actually under contract. Notification of withdrawal can be initiated by the College in cases where a student is suspended or dismissed or can come from a student who wishes to withdraw temporarily or permanently by initiating a withdrawal form and filing it with the appropriate learning center officials. The withdrawal form should be signed by both the student and learning center dean or designee so that it is clear both parties understand the change in the student’s status.

The Dean of the Learning Center must be notified no later than two weeks after the effective date indicated on the withdrawal notification. If the withdrawal notification form reflects a withdrawal date older than two weeks, the College will consider the effective date to be two weeks retroactive from the date the notification is received.

In many cases, withdrawal may be only a temporary intermission. When this is the case, the student should indicate the approximate date for re-enrollment on the withdrawal notification form. Students requesting a temporary intermission of less than one contract month will not be considered withdrawn and tuition liability for that period of time will not cease.

( ) intend ( ) do not intend to be a portfolio for assessment of prior learning experience. I anticipate receiving ( ) sufficient ( ) insufficient academic standing to be considered an Upper Division Student ( ) six or more months of credit for tuition purposes. I also understand that after evaluation of my portfolio my status as upper or lower division may be reassessed and that it may require retroactive billing for adjustments in tuition charges.

Student Name (Please Print) ___________________________ Social Security No. ____________

Student Address ______________________________________ Zip Code _____________

Student Signature ___________________________ Telephone No. _______________

Dean’s Signature ___________________________ Date _______________

Learning Center ___________________________ Orientation Date ____________

This form is ( ) initial enrollment ( ) re-enrollment ( ) change in current enrollment status ( ) Special student under contract

ID Card Prepared ____________

Note to Students Requesting Financial Aid

1) Before enrolling, your financial aid awards should be approved.

2) A delayed payment plan can only be applied to your billing if the College Business Office has an official notice of your financial aid awards.

3) Be sure that your application for financial aid indicated your status as Upper or Lower Division, the same as you have indicated on this agreement. If it did not, you should request the College Financial Aid Office to review your awards.

Mentor ___________________________
APPENDIX K

Flow Diagram of Basic Advisement Pattern

1. INITIAL INQUIRY
   - in person, by phone, mail

2. INFORMATION
   - Visit to Center
   - Faculty roster
   - Array of Programs
   - Discussions, Staff Students

3. APPLICATION
   - to Saratoga
   - Copy to Learning Center

4. ACCEPTANCE

5. ORIENTATION WORKSHOPS
   - Becoming acquainted
   - Skills assessment
   - General advisement

6. MENTOR CONFERENCE
   - Development of Contract

   accepted
   try with new Mentor

7. PROGRAM OF ACTIVITIES
   - Papers
   - Reports
   - Meetings
   - Field Work

8. EVALUATION CONFERENCE

9. DEVELOPMENT PHASE No. 2 PLAN

10. MENTOR CONFERENCE No. 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Albany</th>
<th>Rochester</th>
<th>NYC</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>184</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>254</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ENROLLMENT FIGURES
#### 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December</th>
<th>Buffalo</th>
<th>70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genesee Valley</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long Island</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College-Wide</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Hudson</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Career Models Program</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some programs shared student and faculty count with cosponsors, providing for seeming total discrepancies.

### ALBANY CENTER
#### 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 - 25</td>
<td>12 (32%)</td>
<td>17 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 40</td>
<td>13 (34%)</td>
<td>17 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 46</td>
<td>13 (34%)</td>
<td>20 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admitted</td>
<td>38 (100%)</td>
<td>54 (101%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 16 - 21</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 21 - 30</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 31 - 40</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 41 - 50</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ages 16 - 24</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 25 - 44</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 44</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>510</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M

STUDENT OCCUPATIONS
Fall 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Category*</th>
<th>At time of Admission</th>
<th>At time of Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiprofessional</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor/Public Official</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business/Farm Owner</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trades</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Skilled Trades</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The basic classification scheme utilized in the study was adapted from the U.S. Bureau of the Census framework and elaborated to fit the particular occupational backgrounds of Empire State students.

**The survey was completed during August 1975 and covered graduates from the College over the preceding one and one-half years, years of recession and high unemployment in New York State.
### APPENDIX N

**STUDENT AREAS OF STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>June 1972</th>
<th>June 1974</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Arts</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Economics</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Studies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Studies</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, Math, Technology</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Theory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Responses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Yet Identified</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ALUMNI INTERESTS IN GRADUATE SCHOOL

### APPENDIX 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons Denied Admission</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams required to determine eligibility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC transcript inadequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rerequisites lacking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC transcript unacceptable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay of transcript</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC lacked accreditation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many qualified applicants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overly aggressive in application procedure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical history of applicant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfamiliar with ESC program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for college's own undergraduates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign institution rejection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INSTITUTIONS TO WHICH GRADUATES APPLIED

- Leading Research Universities: 20%
- Doctoral Granting Institutions: 25%
- Comprehensive Colleges and Universities: 39%
- Liberal Arts Colleges: 11%
- Professional Schools: 2%
- Other Kinds of Institutions: 4%
APPENDIX P

STUDENT RECORD FILE

Section I: Registrar's Worksheet

a. Enrollment Agreement
b. Withdrawal/Re-enrollment Forms
c. OPRA Concurrence Memo
d. Degree Program and Approval
e. D&E's
f. Cross Registration Forms
g. Change of Status Notice
h. Notification of Student Transfer
i. Notification of Final Contract
j. Recommendation and Approval for Graduation
k. Graduation Financial Clearance
l. Diploma Name Okay
m. Request for Transcripts
n. Correspondence
o. Material from Admissions (SUNY or Foreign Student Applications, Prospectus, transcripts from other institutions, admission correspondence)

Section II:

a. Learning Contracts

Section III:

a. The Assessment documents: OPRA worksheet, OPRA Concurrence Memo, and Portfolio

Section IV:

a. Student Account Records
APPENDIX Q

Administrative Organization of ESC

Diagram showing the administrative organization of ESC with various positions and their relationships.
APPENDIX R

STUDENT DOCUMENTS: PROCEDURAL FLOW

STUDENT
- a. prepares original
- b. signs
- c. receives approved copy

LEARNING CENTER
- a. checks for complete, accurate information
- b. obtains Dean's signature and date thereof
- c. enters category and/or status and effective date on terminal
- d. sends original to Business Office
- e. files LC copy
  NOT necessary to send copy to Records Center

ENROLLMENT & WITHDRAWAL AGREEMENTS
- 1. Student
- 2. Learning Center
- 3. Business Office

BUSINESS OFFICE/STUDENT ACCOUNTS (original copy)
- a. enters information into computer after verifying form is complete
- b. establishes student file
- c. files Agreement
LEARNING CONTRACT

1. Student
2. Mentor
3. Learning Center
4. Records Center

STUDENT
a. prepares drafts for discussion with Mentor
b. approves and signs
c. receives approved copy

MENTOR
a. develops with student
b. has typed
c. checks for completeness, accuracy, obtains approvals and signatures: student, Associate Dean
d. approves and signs
e. transmits original and copies to Associate Dean
f. receives approved copy

LEARNING CENTER
a. Staff: types and transmits to Mentor for Mentor and student approval and signatures; transmits approved original and copies to Records Center, Mentor, student
b. Associate Dean: checks for complete, accurate information; approves and signs

RECORDS CENTER (original copy)
a. checks for complete, accurate information (returns if necessary)
b. enters into computer (sheets now, directly later)
c. files in student's permanent file

1/25/76
STUDENT
a. prepares drafts for discussions with Mentor
b. approves
c. receives approved copy

MENTOR
a. develops with student, tutor, adjunct
b. obtains contributing evaluations
c. has typed
d. checks for completeness, accuracy
e. approves and signs
f. obtains approvals and signatures: student, tutor, adjunct
g. transmits original and copies to Associate Dean
h. receives approved copy

LEARNING CENTER
a. Staff: types and transmits to Mentor for student and tutor approvals and signatures transmits approved original and copies to Records Center, Mentor, student files copy in student’s Learning Center file
b. Associate Dean: checks for complete, accurate information approves and signs

RECORDS CENTER (original copy)
a. checks for complete, accurate information (returns if necessary)
b. enters into computer (sheets now, directly later)
c. files in student’s permanent file
d. notes on transcript
e. duplicates copies for transcripts (as requested)
STUDENT
a. prepares draft for discussions with Mentor
b. approves
c. receives approved copy

MENTOR
a. develops with student
b. has typed
c. checks for completeness, accuracy
d. reviews and signs
e. transmits to Center Review Committee

REVIEW COMMITTEE (LC)
1. Student
2. Mentor
3. Review Committee
4. OPRA
5. Records Center
a. reviews and approves/rejects
b. chairman signs and transmits to OPRA

OPRA
a. reviews
b. approves
c. transmits approvals to student, LC, RC
d. returns non-permanent documents to student
e. transmits permanent portfolio to RC

RECORDS CENTER (original copy)
a. enters credit, etc. into computer
b. files portfolio and documents in student's permanent file

DEGREE PROGRAM & AMENDMENTS
1. Student
2. Mentor
3. Review Committee
4. OPRA
5. Records Center

2/3/76
NOTIFICATION OF CROSS REGISTRATION

1. Student
2. Mentor
3. Other College
4. Learning Center
5. Business Office
6. Records Center

STUDENT
a. discuss with Mentor
b. incorporates into contract
c. obtains approvals: Mentor, other college, LC Dean

MENTOR
a. discuss with student
b. agrees to arrangement

OTHER COLLEGE
a. approves registration

LEARNING CENTER (DEAN)
a. approves request
b. transmits forms to BO, RC, Mentor

BUSINESS OFFICE (original copy)
a. makes any billing changes
b. records adjustment on form if required
c. enters information into computer
d. files form in student's permanent billing file
e. sends student revised bill

RECORDS CENTER
a. files form in student's permanent file
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**MENTOR**

- a. prepares form
- b. obtains student's signature

**STUDENT**

- a. signs form
- b. receives signed copy

**LEARNING CENTER**

- Staff:
  - a. types form
  - b. obtains Dean's signature
  - c. notes on LC records
  - d. records category and effective date on terminal
  - e. transmits original to VP/AA (Registrar)
  - copies to student, LC files, Bus. Off

**Vice President for Academic Affairs/Registrar**

- a. Registrar: assembles packet for VP review
  - transmits packet
  - receives packet with approval
  - records transaction
  - transmit notification of approval to Learning Center

- b. Vice President: reviews packet
  - transmit approval to Registrar

**Business Office/Student Accounts**

- a. verifies information on own records
- b. enters information into computer
- c. files document
- d. sends adjusted bill if required

4/13/76
MENTOR
a. initiates form with final D&E
b. receives copy of approved form

LEARNING CENTER
a. Staff: prepares form
   - obtains Dean's signature
   - verifies form with Center records
   - transmit form to Registrar, Business Office, Mentor, student
b. (Associate) Dean: receives, reviews, approves final D&E
   - signs Recommendation and return to staff

VICE PRESIDENT for ACADEMIC AFFAIRS/REGISTRAR
a. receives final D&E and Recommendation from Registrar
b. reviews, approves, and returns to Registrar
c. Registrar: requests verification of financial clearance from BO
   - receives approval of VP/AA and notification of
     financial clearance
   - prepares monthly lists of degree candidates for SUNY
     Board of Trustees and congratulatory letter from
     President
   - Transcripts prepared only upon request

BUSINESS OFFICE/STUDENT ACCOUNTS
a. receives copy of Recommendation
b. enters in computer
c. sends adjusted bill if required
d. verifies clearance
e. notes transaction in computer and file
f. transmits clearances to Registrar
g. sends student's file to Records Center for incorporation into
   permanent record after record becomes inactive per schedule

STUDENT
a. receives approved copy
APPENDIX S
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR ERNEST L. BOYER, CHANCELLOR
OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
June 30, 1976

1. What signals did you see in SUNY and in U.S. higher education which indicated that SUNY was ready for a change?

2. Why did you feel it desirable to establish yet another institution within SUNY? Why such a compact time schedule?

3. When proposing a new University College, what was your model?

4. What influences did you have to deal with, external and internal, and how did you deal with them?

5. What roadblocks were there? How did you surpass them?

6. What leadership qualities did you feel were needed in the new college staff?

7. How did you plan to integrate the Empire State experience into SUNY?

8. What made you feel that such a college could retain its own visibility in the vast SUNY system?
APPENDIX T

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR JAMES W. HALL, PRESIDENT
OF EMPIRE STATE COLLEGE
August 8, 1977

It should perhaps be noted that these questions reflect only those areas in which the researcher found no notations in the files.

1. Why was the administrative center concept changed to that of a coordinating center? Why?

2. What judgments were involved when setting forth the original student enrollments? the staffing patterns?

3. Originally, Centers were to be headed by a Director or Associate Dean. Why was this changed to a Dean?

4. When were staff applicants no longer requested to draft sample learning contracts? Why?

5. What were the reasons for housing parts of the student records at the Learning Centers? Why were the procedures changed?

6. Did the Cabinet meet with the Deans prior to the time that Deans' meetings were replaced by the creation of the Administrative Council?
9. What communications problems did you encounter? How did you overcome them?

10. Did creating Empire State College take other SUNY institutions off the hook regarding their needing to develop more individualized learning opportunities?