Academic Process and Structure Working Group: Community Forum Follow Up Survey

The purpose of this survey is to solicit community feedback on each of the models presented during the Academic Process and Structure Working Group Community Forum held on Monday, January 29. If you were not able to attend the community forum, links to the presentation, the working group's charge, membership and related materials can be found on the [project page](#).

The Working Group will review and utilize the information collected to further inform their work and ultimately the final report. Many of the questions below require an indication of agreement or disagreement, and other questions prompt an open-ended response. We welcome all perspectives. Please ensure that your comments are respectful of other people. This survey is anonymous.

Please indicate which division you currently affiliate with:
- Office of Academic Affairs [if selected, branch to role identification item]
- Office of Administration and Finance
- Office of Advancement
- Office of Communications
- Office of Enrollment Management and Marketing
- Office of Integrated Technologies
- Prefer not to state

If division = OAA: How is your role classified?
- Faculty [if selected, branch to level of primary instructional responsibility]
- Professional Staff
- Support Staff
- Management Confidential Staff
- Prefer not to state

If role = Faculty: Where is your primary instructional responsibility?
- Undergraduate level
- Graduate level

The Working Group would like to know whether the models proposed could help reduce the barriers discussed during the community forum.

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree that Model 1 (five colleges) and/or Model 2 (four colleges) could help reduce each of the barriers identified below.

Barrier	Select your rating for **Model 1:**	Select your rating for **Model 2:**
Size: Significant differences exist in schools and/or department size and student enrollment, but resource allocation is somewhat standard, not consistently reflecting the variations.	- Strongly Disagree, - Disagree, - Neither Disagree or Agree, - Agree, - Strongly Agree, - Not Applicable	- Strongly Disagree, - Disagree, - Neither Disagree or Agree, - Agree, - Strongly Agree, - Not Applicable
Communication: Communication structures and pathways across eight schools have naturally developed differently. These differences may result in inconsistency in information delivery and consultation practices. The greater the number of schools, the more likely differences are to occur.	- Strongly Disagree, - Disagree, - Neither Disagree or Agree, - Agree, - Strongly Agree, - Not Applicable	- Strongly Disagree, - Disagree, - Neither Disagree or Agree, - Agree, - Strongly Agree, - Not Applicable
Degree Planning: Undergraduate program degree planning practices vary widely and may be impacted by the number of available faculty, the complexity of programs, school culture, and the lack of shared resources to support the work.	- Strongly Disagree, - Disagree, - Neither Disagree or Agree, - Agree, - Strongly Agree, - Not Applicable	- Strongly Disagree, - Disagree, - Neither Disagree or Agree, - Agree, - Strongly Agree, - Not Applicable
Outcomes Assessment: Undergraduate student learning outcomes assessment (assessment in the major, etc.) varies widely. They may be impacted by the number of available faculty, the complexity of programs, school culture, and	- Strongly Disagree, - Disagree, - Neither Disagree or Agree, - Agree, - Strongly Agree, - Not Applicable	- Strongly Disagree, - Disagree, - Neither Disagree or Agree, - Agree, - Strongly Agree, - Not Applicable

the need for shared resources to support the work.		
Accreditation: Programs have different levels of need for accreditation support. Unit accreditation resources are split across many schools/programs, resulting in inefficiencies and difficulties in communication.	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable
Service Capacity: Some schools have limited capacity to serve on all governance and university committees.	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable
Student Pathways: There are difficulties and/or inefficiencies for students transitioning from undergraduate to graduate programs. Dual degree programs are underutilized.	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable
Faculty Collaboration: There are difficulties and/or inefficiencies for collaboration among faculty who are split across different departments, schools, and degree levels.	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable

The Working Group would like to know whether the models proposed could support the Office of Academic Affairs' ability to advance the strategic priorities and objectives of Elevate '28. Please rate your level of agreement concerning strategic objectives related to the Student Success strategic priority area.

Objective related to the **Student Success** strategic priority area	Select your rating for **Model 1:**	Select your rating for **Model 2:**
Objective 1: Increase student success by reducing or eliminating barriers to enrollment, retention, and completion.	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable
Objective 2: Improve the student experience.	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable
Objective 3: Reduce or eliminate equity gaps on student success metrics for underrepresented and/or historically underserved students.	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable

The Working Group would like to know whether the models proposed could support the Office of Academic Affairs' ability to advance the strategic priorities and objectives of Elevate '28. Please rate your level of agreement concerning strategic objectives related to the Academic and Inclusive Excellence strategic priority area.

Objective related to the **Academic and Inclusive Excellence** strategic priority area.	Select your rating for **Model 1:**	Select your rating for **Model 2:**

Objective 1: Strengthen the quality, breadth, and currency of degrees, certificates, and other learning opportunities to meet the needs of students, employers, and communities.	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable
Objective 2: Expand and scale our approaches to effective, innovative, and inclusive teaching and online learning.	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable
Objective 3: Promote the full range of possibilities for how and where students gain knowledge and provide avenues to evaluate and credential that learning.	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable

The Working Group would like to know whether the models proposed could support the Office of Academic Affairs' ability to advance the strategic priorities and objectives of Elevate '28. Please rate your level of agreement concerning strategic objectives related to the Organizational Effectiveness strategic priority area.

Objective related to the **Organizational Effectiveness** strategic priority area.	Select your rating for **Model 1:**	Select your rating for **Model 2:**
Objective 1: Create a teaching and learning environment that fosters mutual respect, advances clear communication, and engenders a culture of belonging, trust, and inclusivity.	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree, • Neither Disagree or Agree, • Agree, • Strongly Agree, • Not Applicable
Objective 2: Fully implement robust continuous improvement	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree,	• Strongly Disagree, • Disagree,

processes and effectiveness tracking across the division.	- Neither Disagree or Agree, - Agree, - Strongly Agree, - Not Applicable	- Neither Disagree or Agree, - Agree, - Strongly Agree, - Not Applicable

The Working Group would like to know whether the models proposed could support the Office of Academic Affairs' ability to advance the strategic priorities and objectives of Elevate '28. Please rate your level of agreement concerning strategic objectives related to the Raising Our Public Profile strategic priority area.

Objective related to the **Raising Our Public Profile** strategic priority area	Select your rating for **Model 1:**	Select your rating for **Model 2:**
Objective 1: Position Empire State University as a SUNY leader in effective and innovative applied teaching and learning and student success.	- Strongly Disagree, - Disagree, - Neither Disagree or Agree, - Agree, - Strongly Agree, - Not Applicable	- Strongly Disagree, - Disagree, - Neither Disagree or Agree, - Agree, - Strongly Agree, - Not Applicable
Objective 2: Become a SUNY leader in applied scholarship and creative activities.	- Strongly Disagree, - Disagree, - Neither Disagree or Agree, - Agree, - Strongly Agree, - Not Applicable	- Strongly Disagree, - Disagree, - Neither Disagree or Agree, - Agree, - Strongly Agree, - Not Applicable
Objective 3: Establish and grow centers for distinction of SUNY, state, and national renown.	- Strongly Disagree, - Disagree, - Neither Disagree or Agree, - Agree, - Strongly Agree, - Not Applicable	- Strongly Disagree, - Disagree, - Neither Disagree or Agree, - Agree, - Strongly Agree, - Not Applicable

What types of opportunities could emerge from our implementation of Model 1 (five colleges) or Model 2 (four colleges)? (Open ended)

What are the potential unintended consequences of Model 1 (five colleges) or Model 2 (four colleges)? (Open ended)

In your opinion, what are the best aspects of our current model? (Open ended)

Do you have other recommendations for the working group to consider? (Open ended)