Introduction

The State of the University Address is a time to celebrate, to thank our faculty and staff, to remind us of our heritage, and to challenge us to achieve our goals, especially in the face of mounting criticism of our profession. It is, indeed, a time of reckoning and recharging.

Adelphi College was chartered in 1896. It grew out of Adelphi Academy, which was started in Brooklyn in 1863, the third year of the Civil War, and founded with the support of war heroes, abolitionists, suffragists, and believers in religious tolerance. The College was created at a time of important developments for higher education, including the Land Grant Act, the establishment of what were to become significant colleges and major universities, changes in the collegiate curriculum, and advancement of the notion of service to society. At the same time, there was tremendous progress in technology, electronics, and communications for use in instruction as well as for personal convenience. Like today, it was a time of concern about immigration, public health, and a “safety net” to support those in difficult circumstances. These forces, together with the philosophy of the founders, helped forge Adelphi’s mission.

In 1929, Adelphi College moved to Garden City in pursuit of additional space for the increasing enrollment and growing programs. This was an expansive time, with faculty and students developing relationships with those in countries beyond U.S. boarders. It also was a time of economic turmoil, which eventually affected Adelphi and caused the College to enter into receivership and enrollment to fall – but the College persevered and grew again.

An important turning point in Adelphi’s history was the period of 1943-1948, when the College responded to the need for nurses during the war effort and to the needs of society after it by enrolling men again. While men were no longer admitted to the normal cycle following 1912, the state-authorized Charter was never changed.

However, the return to coeducation was not an easy one. Apparently, the Board had forgotten the Charter specified Adelphi as a “co-educational liberal arts college” and before adopting a rule in favor of admitting men again, the students voted against it in a straw poll vote.
The Board of Trustees first voted to deny the admission of men, even with federal and state support for colleges to expand, and with the offer of funds to provide facility alterations. The Trustees ultimately voted to admit men, in part because the College was about to lose five hundred cadet nursing students, and the prospect of increasing enrollment was attractive. In fact, in September 1946, the College opened with 850 veterans beginning their studies. Courses open to the veterans included basic engineering, pre-medicine, pre-law, business administration, and preparation for teaching.

The faculty was increased by thirty-five members to handle the increase in students. Additional classrooms and large dining facilities were provided. In 1942, Adelphi enrolled 652 students, with 61 faculty members; by 1949, there were 2,215 students with 196 faculty members and 24 special lecturers in the School of Nursing.

Following this peak enrollment of veterans, enrollment began to decline as the veterans completed their accelerated programs, and the effects of the Korean War and inflation took their toll on enrollment.

During this period, higher education in general, which had been for the socio-economic elite, and Adelphi in particular, which was born of the community, expanded in response to the Veteran’s Readjustment Act or “G.I. Bill,” and proved to be responsive, resilient, and ready, three themes to which I will return.

Reading and talking with Adelphi alumni about the College’s response to external forces in that era provides an interesting context for thinking about higher education today, the numerous criticisms recounted in books, magazine articles, radio, and television, and Adelphi’s ability to continue its positive path.


---

Those who are in and outside higher education, including me, raise pointed concerns about our enterprise. While my “Love Story” details what I admire, what causes me anguish, and what I anticipate, most of the other works cited echo the following themes detailed in Former Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings’ Commission Report of 2006:

What we have learned over the last year makes clear that American higher education has become what, in the business world, would be called a mature enterprise: increasingly risk-averse, at times self-satisfied, and unduly expensive. It is an enterprise that has yet to address the fundamental issues of how academic programs and institutions must be transformed to serve the changing needs of a knowledge economy. It has yet to successfully confront the impact of globalization, rapidly evolving technologies, an increasingly diverse and aging population, and an evolving marketplace, characterized by new needs and new paradigms.”

The list of criticisms goes on to include grade inflation; the expansion of programs and courses unrelated to the goals expressed in a mission statement; and an increase in administrative staff. Other themes are that tuition is too high; student debt is growing so fast it is exceeding consumer debt; colleges have an insatiable appetite for money and an agenda to spend all that they can raise; the cost structure of higher education is “out of control” like that of the healthcare system; universities fail to educate; and the economic benefits of a college education no longer exist.

Among these complaints are that one-third of students did not take any courses with more than forty pages of reading required per week; half of students did not take a single course in which they wrote more than twenty pages over the course of the semester; the average amount of time spent studying by college students has dropped by


more than 50% since the 1960’s, yet grade point averages have increased; 45% of students do not demonstrate any significant improvements in learning during their first two years of college; and 36% of students do not demonstrate any significant improvement of learning over four years of college.\(^4\)

Not surprisingly, the data reported show a direct relationship between faculty expectations, reading and writing requirements, and scores on measures of student learning.

It is fair to ask, then, to what extent and in what ways do these accusations relate to Adelphi? Are we risk-averse, self-satisfied, and unduly expensive?

Our data show that seniors ask more questions and work harder than freshmen; and upper division students and seniors are more likely to come to class prepared. They are more likely to discuss ideas from readings or classes with faculty outside of class; they improve in the ability to examine the strengths and weaknesses of views on a topic or issue; their experience here contributes to their ability to synthesize and organize ideas, information, or experiences; and time at Adelphi contributes to students’ ability to write and speak clearly and effectively, as well as to think critically and analytically. Adelphi students advance in their ability to work effectively with others; acquire job or work-related knowledge and skills; spend significant amounts of time on studying and on academic work; and learn effectively on their own.\(^5\)

Nevertheless, there is a significant disparity between faculty and student perceptions about faculty engagement; and student performance on the Capstone Assessment suggests that, while we have made progress, we still have much work to do in the areas of communication skills and critical and integrative thinking. There appears to be a strong relationship between faculty emphasis on learning goals and student performance. Surprise: students learn what we emphasize.\(^6\)

These concerns are acknowledged in AU2015, whose goals include:

1. Recognition as a center of intellectual and creative activity;
2. Relevance in a changing world;
3. Student success in a range of educational goals; and
4. Sustained reputation as an excellent, yet affordable, University.

The Board of Trustees adopted these goals, agreed to metrics, and reframed them for special monitoring, as follows:

1. Student learning, satisfaction, success, retention, and graduation, especially in relation to the number of full-time faculty;

\(^4\) Arum, op. cit.
\(^5\) Office of Research and Planning, Adelphi University, 2011.
\(^6\) Ibid.
2. Interdisciplinary programs, especially as related to the Center for Health Innovation;
3. Facilities Master Plan update; and
4. Fundraising

These goals are not risk-averse; not self-satisfied; and not aimed at undue expense. In fact, Adelphi’s tuition is about 25% less than tuition at some nearby institutions, and we raised undergraduate tuition for this year only 2%. In other words, a student can study for five years at Adelphi for what it costs for four years at nearby institutions.

While we have these four goals, and have made great strides, I wonder how much progress we have made in terms of the Spelling’s Commission assessment, and in what ways AU2015 helps us respond to these imperatives. Surely, our goal for “relevance in a changing world” refers to globalization, the use of various technologies, and diverse and aging populations. Our new programs in Public Health and Informatics are exemplary of this. “Student success in a range of educational goals” can refer to a “marketplace characterized by new needs and new paradigms.” In fact, our goals, strategies, and metrics are related to the challenges posed to institutions of higher education, not because someone said we should, but because we decided that these were the right goals for Adelphi.

Our goals for excellence and affordability are addressed by our attention to student success, fiscal discipline, and both the Annual Fund and the Campaign for Adelphi – which I am pleased to report is entering its final phase.

The question is, will we fulfill our goals? Will we take them seriously and pursue their attainment – as a community – because we believe in them, not because some might view them as a mandate?

As we have said before, strategic planning is about principles for decision making and priorities for action. AU2015 expresses both our principles and our priorities. The achievement of these goals requires effort from each of us.

Our goals for student learning, success, satisfaction, retention, and graduation should be of primary concern. These are, of course, partially related to admission requirements, because there has to be “fit” between admission and academic expectations for good results.

Nevertheless, I wonder about how well we introduce new faculty and part-time instructors to our expectations for excellence, and satisfactory student performance, as expressed in grades of “A” or “C”? How well do we provide advising to help guide students in their choices?

In this day of “careerist” thinking, I continue to believe that students are more likely to succeed in their studies if they pursue something for which they have a passion.
This means that, if the passion is for dance, or art, or anthropology, instead of someone else’s choice of pre-medicine, marketing, or accounting, students are more likely to be motivated, serious, inquisitive, successful in their studies, and ready and desirable for employment or graduate school.

Extracurricular activities, including sports, are important, too, and we support and congratulate our student-athletes who won five conference championships this spring; the Men’s and Women’s Lacrosse teams for playing in national championships, and the women for taking their third one in a row.

Students should be guided to seek internships in business, government, or non-profit organizations to learn and enhance job-readiness skills or graduate school preparation.

This combination of pursuit of one’s passion and placements in the “real world,” supervised placements in combination with a field of study, helps prepare students for the first job, the start of a career or series of careers, and graduate or professional school. Studying in another culture is an important part of this preparation, as are undergraduate research opportunities. It is our responsibility to create such an environment.

I think the fact that we are taking such questions and criticisms seriously is noteworthy. Provost Insler has held a workshop with the deans to discuss the criticisms in Academically Adrift, and the Faculty Senate leadership, deans, senior staff, and I will devote a full day away from campus for a discussion of the criticisms and what we at Adelphi can do to improve our effectiveness.

I believe that these actions, and many others, give testimony to the fact that Adelphi is a reflective institution, one that believes in institutional learning and wants to improve, and is committed to a culture of conscience that is dedicated to the transformative power of teaching and learning.

One of the ways in which we have shown our commitment to being reflective is in how we go about assuring effectiveness in the quality of what we do and the efficiency of the cost structure to accomplish it.

In one of the newest books about higher education, Abelard to Apple, the author offers ten rules for higher education leaders and institutions to consider. I think they correlate well with ours, and urge you to review them:

1. Forget about who is above you – no envy
2. Focus on what differentiates you - character
3. Establish your own brand
4. Don’t romanticize your weaknesses
5. Be open - transparent
6. Balance faculty-centrism with student-centrism
7. Use technology
8. Cut costs in half
9. Define your own measures of success
10. Adopt the new “Wisconsin Idea” of connection with the community

Consider this: the goals of AU2015 are to reinforce Adelphi’s distinctive identity; be open to the world as well as to each other; define our measures of success; and be affordable by controlling costs.

As a campus president for 26 years, during economic booms and busts, I have developed my own set of philosophies, policies, and practices which form a foundation for assessing institutional effectiveness and efficiencies, and assist in assuring campus productivity in the use of human and capital resources.

In order to assess the issues of effectiveness and productivity in a meaningful way, a campus community, led by the faculty, must look first at mission and purpose. That is, the “ends” of education must be understood clearly if the “means” to achieve it are to be evaluated sensibly.

The primary purpose of higher education is to nurture talents; enhance students’ capabilities for critical thinking; foster a global perspective; advance skills in writing, speaking, and listening; promote the attainment of general and expert knowledge; advance skills in quantitative and qualitative reasoning, and abilities in analysis and languages; develop values, including teamwork, respect for others, and citizenship; and help students prepare for careers and commerce.

I believe that education should encourage initiative, curiosity, compassion, and strong communication skills; the ability to wonder, to imagine, to tolerate ambiguity, to take a chance, to risk failure in pursuit of a greater goal; not foolhardy risk, but a calculated risk.

This is the “imagination age.” This is a time, perhaps more than ever, that requires creative approaches to solving problems. In fact, I think the two most important aspects of learning are imagination and history: how to imagine “what if?” or “what about?”, and to understand what came before, because it is that on which we will build in approaching the future. We build on our heritage, but must not be trapped by tradition.

Imagination permits us to see patterns, to see where they diverge and where they converge. It requires us to question, to listen, to tolerate the silence, and to comprehend before we respond. This form of curriculum is a covenant between a college and a student.

We also must consider the answers we hear, because, so often, “ideology knows the answer before the question has been asked,” as stated by George Packer in *The New Yorker*. It was Daniel Bell who wrote, “Ideology makes it unnecessary for people to
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confront individual issues on their individual merits.” So, again, focus on questions which so often are hidden by answers, as James Baldwin advised us.

With this understanding, we can then reflect on Abelard to Apple’s ten rules, and examine ways for improving productivity in higher education, by which we mean using human and capital assets to their best advantage and in the most efficient and effective ways. To do so requires using valid data to set measurable goals, assess progress, and refine goals; monitor progress over time; and compare results to benchmarks, keeping in mind Einstein’s maxim “that everything that can be counted does not necessarily count, and everything that counts cannot necessarily be counted.”

Toward this end, I have outlined ten critical considerations.

1. **Students are priority one:** Institutions should make sure that there are strong connections between and among admission standards, academic expectations and student support services, and student learning, satisfaction, success, retention, and graduation. If there are weak links, they should be challenged and fixed.

2. **Students need to complete:** Retention and completion rates must receive greater priority. Nationally, with less than 50% of those who enter into college graduating in six years, there is an enormous expenditure of federal, state, and private funds whose purpose is to support baccalaureate education but which are not helping achieve the goals of student learning and degree attainment.

3. **Go beyond fall and spring:** Colleges should be using their capital assets eleven months of the year, allowing for at least a month for repairs and rehabilitation from frequent use. Colleges and schools are the only organizations which generally “give up” one-quarter of the year without maximizing efficient and effective use of human and physical assets. This can be accomplished even with a semester system. Summer sessions, with camps and high school programs as a service to the broader community, are a logical choice. Some institutions may find the trimester system the better alternative.

4. **Don’t forget the “orphans”:** Class schedules should be spaced over at least six days of the week, making optimal use of classrooms and laboratories throughout the day and evening, while recognizing the needs of the students who attend those classes. Inefficient use of classrooms and laboratories, such as heavy reliance on Monday-Wednesday-Friday at 10:00 a.m., or Tuesday-Thursday mornings, results in orphaned rooms, and the demand for more space when maximum utilization could reduce the need for space and the subsequent debt and gifts required to increase the supply of classrooms and offices.

---

9 Ibid.
5. **Size counts:** Class size is another variable which can be used in increasing productivity. There are good reasons to have small classes and equally good reasons to have some large lectures and on-line courses. Each institution should have a strategy for achieving the optimal distribution of classes by size, format, and time of day that allows it to reach its pedagogical goals. Philosophy and furniture must be in synch. What are our goals?

6. **Relevant research inspires:** It is essential to ensure that internally funded research is connected to professional development for teaching and student success, including student involvement in faculty scholarship. If there is a weak link, the funding should be questioned. In too many cases, a focus on research to enhance institutional prestige is contrary to an emphasis on improvements in student learning.

7. **The right “app” matters:** Technology is an important enhancement for teaching, advising, and learning, and investments in it should be designed for those goals to be attained. Often, colleges invest for the “bleeding edge” instead of the “leading edge”, and spend money on tools which are of little relevance. With the right approach, teachers and learners can connect anywhere, at any time, challenging conventional notions of space, time, and responsibilities, with fast feedback.

8. **And the proof is in the ...:** Just as a checkbook can reveal the priorities of the holder, so can campus rewards reveal what is valued. In what ways are the rewards of appointment, tenure, promotion, release time, and sabbaticals related to the goals of student learning?

9. **Get a second opinion:** Institutions should rigorously review academic programs and administrative organizations and functions every five to seven years, with a one-year post-review assessment. The use of outside reviewers with a clear mandate is a critical means for assuring that programs are up-to-date; fulfilling strategy, alignment, and goals; making the best use of resources; ensuring relevance to institutional mission; and improving results. The same can be said for administrative functions and services, especially when one compares organizational make-up and expense to benchmark institutions.

    The result is a game-plan for changing, adding, or reducing programs and services, and for comparing expense ratios over time and against other campuses. This information, together with that gained from professional journals and conferences, will often help identify priorities for new investment. Routine reports to Board of Trustees committees are an effective method for monitoring progress. This is how we saved Physics from termination and promoted optics as an emphasis.

10. **Look at yourself:** An interesting and productive exercise is to take a step back, look at your institution as a “visitor”, and review the entire campus with a
theatre professor to assess the facilities and landscape as a “stage set”. Consider how open spaces, energy flows, and signage can be improved to advance the campus “story” as expressed in the campus mission statement. I did this with Professor Nick Petron, Head of Theatre.

Another activity is to convene the senior staff each week to review requests to fill open positions or to review requests for salary increases, in order to determine whether the requests are justified and where a position is most needed.

Still another discipline is to have division heads review (1) the organization and staffing charts, comparing resource commitments by department and larger units, in terms of organizational design, and against other institutions; (2) the curriculum and course requirements by assessing the deployment of faculty, by level and type, for student requirements and achievement, and assuring that courses necessary for student attainment and progress are not pre-empted by courses based on more narrow interests; and (3) the use of space by day and time for classrooms, offices, extracurricular activities, and other purposes. Significant improvements in the use of these assets can be found by having different perspectives cross-check each other in these ways.

Through these means, we can assist in establishing and assessing our priorities for effectiveness and efficiency.

As a result of these exercises and routine reviews, we at Adelphi have fewer senior administrators, higher graduation rates, and charge less in tuition than nearby competitors. And yet, we have completed almost $200 million in new construction and major renovations, with very little debt and a strong bond rating. We have added 119 new faculty in recent years, have had no furloughs or layoffs, no stalled or cancelled construction projects and have strong enrollment. Our newest facility, a residence hall, also with geothermal heating and cooling, opened this fall. For these and other reasons, Adelphi was named a “Fiske Guide” ‘Best Buy’ for the sixth straight year.

Another aspect of AU2015 is the development of an updated Facilities Master Plan. Faculty were involved in the essential “Discovery Phase” conducted by the architects. The Plan, tentatively entitled “Centennial 2029,” representing 100 years since the College moved to Garden City, will be presented to the Board of Trustees this weekend in draft form. It is an attempt to assess how we use space, our needs for space, and which buildings, because of design and construction materials, should be considered for radical change or removal, and what new buildings might be conceived. Just as we must envision what our educational approach will be in 50 years, so also we must plan our facilities for future needs, and then facilitate the “becoming.”

The purpose of this plan is to continually improve the environment for effective teaching and learning. It is not intended to seek a radical increase in the number of students at any one time or place, although we do forecast enrollment increases resulting from new programs related to the Center for Health Innovation and other aspects of AU2015, and from continuing improvements in student retention.
Another essential characteristic of our vision is that of partnerships. One such partner is ELS, through which we provide the venue for students from around the world to learn English in order to enter American colleges and universities, and then grant admissions to selected students. During the past ten years, about 14,000 students have attended ELS programs housed at Adelphi, 746 have entered our bachelors and masters programs, 279 have graduated, and 240 are still enrolled.

Another partner is New Seminary, with whom we have arranged access to programs for students who have special needs and special commitments to their Orthodox community. Since 1998, 444 students who have enrolled through this partnership have graduated from Adelphi. This past year, 113 New Seminary students were studying in University College and another 41 were in the School of Nursing.

Together, we are able to help each group accomplish their goals and add to the fulfillment of Adelphi’s mission. We also offer the MBA to groups of physicians at a health system; have numerous articulation agreements with community colleges; and provide long-standing teacher preparation programs with the New York City Department of Education.

Other partners include clinical sites at hospitals, psychotherapy practices, social service agencies, schools, municipalities, and businesses. A variety of internship programs at for-profit and not-for-profit organizations add to our capacity for mission fulfillment, as do our programs for voluntarism and mentoring. The innovative Adelphi Community Fellows Program places specially prepared students in select non-profit organizations for paid summer internships, supported by donors, in response to important regional needs and students’ need for meaningful employment.

A critical but often over-looked opportunity for partnership is represented by alumni. Instead of thinking of them only as “graduates”, we can think of them as potential life-long learning clients. After all, our 100,000 alumni have both experience with Adelphi and an affinity; they represent major prospects for continuing professional and cultural education on-line and at different sites, all leading to new ways to define enrollment and mission fulfillment.

In addition, a program called COACH (Count on Alumni for Career Help) brings alumni to the University to talk with students about careers and possibilities, and students to their work places to do the same.

Several initiatives, such as the Long Island Institute for Non-Profit Leadership, the Institute for Parenting, the Bridges Program for those with Autism, the Freshman Community Action Program, the New York State-Adelphi Breast Cancer Hotline and Counseling Center, the Office of Volunteer and Community Services, iSoRCE (formerly called the Center for Social Innovation), Vital Signs – the social health indicators project, the America Reads/America Counts initiatives, and a television show on “Exploring
Critical Issues,” expand our capacity for mission fulfillment by working on big issues with other organizations and enterprises.

Through these ways, plus courses which blend in-person and distance technology instruction, well as other services on- and off-campus, we are able to serve the educational needs of the greater population and extend our capacity to fulfill mission in ways we could never do on campus alone.

Universities engage in planning and support sustainable developments as actor, scholar, and teacher. Universities must be “learning” organizations, with the institution and its leaders as students, listening and knowing how to learn together. A university is local as well as global, with projects to serve the local community, seeking LEED certification to help benefit the geographic area, and acting as an economic, intellectual, and cultural force for the larger region. Adelphi engages the world through the Levermore Global Scholars Program, the Ambassador Lecture Series, programming with global themes, the Study Abroad programs we have supported, and in many other ways.

In conclusion, there are many criticisms of American higher education. I challenge some of these assertions in general, and do not think they apply overall to Adelphi in particular. Nevertheless, there are ways we can and must improve, and if we reflect on what we know, and compare it to what we want to achieve, I believe we can make a difference. We have shown the motivation, innovative spirit, and resilience over time necessary to respond and reinvent our institution successfully. This is good, and necessary, because we must act as if this time “is different”. In this “imagination age”, let’s work to make certain that what we do is valued, even in the face of social, historical, and economic forces of momentous influence.

Therefore, let us pledge to approach each day, each class, and each student as if we are making a memory for him or her, for us, and for an institution that has been vibrant for 115 years, and is preparing for at least another century ahead.

Thank you.