

COMMUTERS: THIS FORM IS YOUR CHANCE TO HELP BEAT THE ENERGY CRISIS WITH CAR POOLS AND/OR BUS SERVICE--PLEASE USE IT!!!!

The Institutional Services Department is attempting to assist employees in organizing car pools and to plan bus routes for longer distance commuter bus service. If you are interested in either or both of these programs, please give the general information and other appropriate information below and return form to:

Director, General Institutional Services
Administration, Room 185

GENERAL INFORMATION

NAME (Last, First, M.I.) _____ HOME ADDRESS (Number and Street) _____

CITY, TOWN OR VILLAGE _____ STATE _____ ZIP CODE _____ HOME TELEPHONE NUMBER
AREA _____ EXCH. _____ NUMBER _____

UNIVERSITY ADDRESS (Building and Room Number) _____ PARKING LOT _____ UNIVERSITY TELEPHONE NUMBER _____

COMMUTATION SCHEDULE	LEAVE HOME (Time) _____	ARRIVE UNIVERSITY (Time) _____	REMARKS: _____
	LEAVE UNIVERSITY (Time) _____	ARRIVE HOME (Time) _____	REMARKS: _____

CAR POOL INFORMATION

POOL PARTICIPATION DAYS (Appropriate Days of Week) _____

DRIVING AVAILABILITY
 Share Driving as needed
 Non-Driving Participant

VEHICLE CAPACITY (No. of Persons) _____

ARE YOU WILLING TO HELP ORGANIZE A CAR POOL? YES NO

ARE YOU CURRENTLY IN A CAR POOL? YES NO If Yes, Give Number of Participants: _____

BUS SERVICE INFORMATION

Bus service - if provided - will be on an at-cost fare basis and will operate once at A.M. and P.M. rush hours on each route. It will not be available on a per diem basis, nor for distances of less than five miles. Routes will be determined by locations of potential users.

I will participate in commuter bus service if available - provided that monthly fare is below \$ _____ dollars per month. Please be realistic, as the feasibility of providing bus service depends on its ability to cover cost.

Personnel News.....

You may recall that on the day of the ice storm, Monday, December 17, 1973, President Toll urged all supervisors to permit employees to depart at approximately 3:00-3:30 p.m., because of hazardous weather conditions.

President Toll made a strong plea to the Civil Service Commission to have the attendance rules waived in this instance. The University has recently been advised by the Commission that employees who departed early due to the weather conditions must charge such early departure to their leave credits, unless they make up the time on a compensatory basis on a schedule mutually agreed upon with their supervisor and not requiring overtime. There is no statutory or contractual authorization to excuse absences from work due to weather conditions without charge to credits.

The Office of Personnel is sorry to have to transmit this sad news to you.

Secondary Teaching

Student Teaching Applications for secondary placement, 1974-75, FALL and SPRING, must be completed between January 21 and February 21, 1974. Applications are available in the Education Department Office, Room 477, Soc. Sci. B.; they should be returned no later than February 21, 1974.

CALENDAR

The Calendar does not appear in this issue because of space limitations resulting from the reprinting of the Middle States Evaluation Report. The Calendar will be resumed in next week's issue.

DR. ARIEH SACHS, POET, AND CHAIRMAN OF THEATER STUDIES AT THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY IN JERUSALEM, WILL SPEAK ON "AN OUTLINE OF JEWISH AND HEBREW THEATER INCLUDING WARTIME" IN CALDERONE THEATER, SURGE B, ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, AT 2:30 P.M.

Weintraub Exhibit

The First Floor Gallery in the Administration Bldg. presents a photographic exhibit by Michael Weintraub, student photographer for University Relations. Included in the display are photos taken at the Stage XII Day Care Center and a photographic essay entitled, "A Sunday Afternoon in Manhattan". Exhibit will run through February 22 from 9a.m. to 5p.m. weekdays.

THE COMPLETE TEXT OF THE MIDDLE STATES EVALUATION IN THIS ISSUE

(see pages 2-4)

"The team is impressed by the enormous potential of Stony Brook as a major intellectual resource for its region and by the considerable progress which has already been made in bringing this to fruition."

"...Stony Brook stands out in terms of its potential to accomplish the multipurpose mission which lies ahead, and deserves high praise for its efforts to date."

"Stony Brook is to be commended for its strong program of research, which in turn reflects the high professional calibre of the vast majority of its faculty."

"...we hope that the Evaluation Team Report, like the Self-Study Report, will be widely distributed within the institution so as to stimulate ongoing discussion, review, and action."

ON CAMPUS SUMMER HOUSING

On-campus housing will be extremely scarce during the 1974 summer semester. Construction work on the High Temperature Hot Water system is scheduled for that period, and this work will require major excavations along the South Loop Road and around various Quads. To facilitate the completion of this work and to maintain safety standards, all Quads involved will be closed.

Limited housing will be available in G and H Quads, with priority given to those who must remain on campus because of obvious hardships.

Applications for on-campus housing will be available by April 1 in the Housing Office.

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING IF YOU ARE PLANNING TO ATTEND THE COMING SUMMER SESSIONS:

*ON-CAMPUS HOUSING WILL ONLY BE AVAILABLE FOR PROPERLY REGISTERED STUDENTS.

*PRIORITY WILL BE GIVEN TO THOSE WITH OBVIOUS HARDSHIPS.

*HOLDING AN ON-CAMPUS SUMMER JOB DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY MEAN THAT A STUDENT CAN GET ON-CAMPUS SUMMER HOUSING.

WOMEN'S WEEKEND: FEBRUARY 22-24

Stony Brook's Women's Center will present a "Women's Weekend" on campus February 22-24.

Described as a "cultural, social and educational festival" by its student organizers, the Weekend will highlight various aspects of the feminist culture.

Black feminist attorney Flo Kennedy will be the guest of the day on Friday, February 22. She will conduct an informal workshop at 4:30 p.m., in Kelly D (Experimental College) and will speak at 8 p.m., in the Union Auditorium. A "Women's Dance and Wine and Cheese Party" at 10 p.m., will end the day's events.

On Saturday, February 23, the Women's Center will conduct more than 20 workshops on women, feminism and relevant topics. Scheduled to take place in the Union from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m., and from 2:30 to 4:30 p.m., such workshops as "Middle-Aged Women," "Marriage and Feminism," "Women in Revolution," "Human Liberation," "Women in Politics," "Self Defense," "Sexism in Education," "Lesbianism," "Feminism and Socialism," "Sexuality," "Child Care," and "Women and Health/Self-Help," are planned.

At 8 p.m., The New York Feminist Theatre, a new theatre troupe which will give its premiere

performance on campus, will perform in Ammann College. The Theatre will present an unstructured theatre experience of, for and about women. Lavendar Jane, the all-women music group that bills itself as a "musical adventure," will perform in Ammann at 9:30 p.m.

Other special events planned for Saturday include a sculpture exhibit by Mary Mann in the Union Gallery, a photography exhibit called "Women by Women" in the Women's Center, and a selection of short films by women in the Union Auditorium.

On Sunday, February 24, poet Hannah Rogers will speak at 2:30 p.m., in the Buffeteria. She will be followed by folksinger Hedy West at 3 p.m. Other Sunday events are a Bagel Breakfast and a volleyball game.

Student Jessica Hirschhorn, who helped organize and plan the Weekend, says that it's being held to "unify all women and contribute to the great and growing feminist culture."

Registration for Women's Weekend will take place from 12 noon to 8 p.m., in the Union Lobby on Friday, February 22. Suggested donation for the entire weekend is \$3 (\$3.50 at the door). For additional information, call the Women's Center at 6-3540.

SPORTS NEWS SWIMMING



Stony Brook's only woman varsity swimmer, Leah Holland, and teammates.

Varsity swimmers at Stony Brook are in the midst of an unprecedented season. With a February 6 victory over Adelphi University, the Patriot swimmers have chalked up an impressive streak, winning their last ten consecutive meets.

In the final weeks of the season they will be facing tough competition with a difficult meet against Columbia University here at 2 p.m. on Saturday, February 16, and the Metropolitan Championships set for Monmouth College on Feb. 28, March 1 and 2.

The last Patriot victory, the seventh in a row at home after a

season-opening loss to Brooklyn College, again was marked by two more Stony Brook records by the school's top swimmer, Erik Lieber. A sophomore with no previous high school swimming experience, Lieber recorded new times in the 500-yard freestyle (5:14.9) and 1,000-yard freestyle (11:00.1) events.

"Every time Erik gets into the pool he breaks a record," said Patriot Diving Manager Al Sajacki. Lieber holds two other individual Stony Brook freestyle records, in the 200-yard (1:56.1) and 1650-yard (18:55.0) events, and also is a member of the

record-setting four-man 400 yard freestyle relay team (3:33.8).

"Erik definitely has got a shot at the nationals for the 500," said Ken Lee, who hopes to return next fall as swimming coach and is presently teaching part-time here. In Lee's stead, Ron Harris is serving as coach of the team.

The season's victories give proof to the team's overall performance. The divers, for example, have captured first place 17 out of 20 times, led by Jim Doering, an 18-year-old freshman. In the four events in which he participates, Doering has set two records.

Three other individual swimming records also have been set this season. John Brisson has set two, in the 200-yard individual medley (2:16.4) and the 100-yard backstroke (0:59.5), and Mitch Prussman a third in the 200-yard breaststroke (2:32.4). The team also has set a mark in the 400-yard medley relay (4:01.0).

"That's a pretty good haul for one year," said Leah Holland, a sophomore swimmer, who has an excellent chance to compete in the women's nationals. "The team's going to be even better next year," she smiled. "We're only losing one person, the captain, Neil Manis."

REPORT TO THE FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION, TRUSTEES OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT STONY BROOK

By AN EVALUATION TEAM REPRESENTING THE COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION OF THE MIDDLE STATES ASSOCIATION

Prepared After Study of the Institution's Self-Study Report and a Visit to Its Campus on December 9, 10, 11 and 12, 1973

The members of the team:

JOHN H. BERTHEL, University Librarian, Johns Hopkins University

ARCHIE L. BUFFKINS, Chancellor, University of Maryland

RICHARD U. BYERRUM, Dean College of Natural Science, Michigan State University

HELEN E. CLARKE, Assistant to Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, University of Maryland

CECELIA HODGES DREWRY, Assistant Dean for Continuing Education, Associate Professor of English, Princeton University

EDWARD V. ELLIS, Associate Dean for Continuing Education, Associate Professor of Public Health, Pennsylvania State University

CLARENCE MONDALE, Director, GW-Washington Project, George Washington University

ANGUS E. TAYLOR, Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of California (Central Office)

B. RICHARD TEARE, University Professor of Engineering, Carnegie-Mellon University

EDITH BICKLEY, Student, University of Maryland

ROBERT LUCAS, Student, Temple University

DAYTON S. PICKETT, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Faculties, Bloomsburg State College

ERNEST A. LYNTON, Sr. Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of Massachusetts, Chairman.

Evaluation Team Associate

Belan M. Serra, Professor Graduate School of Social Work, University of Puerto Rico

Working with the team:

Charles W. Meinert, Associate in Higher Education, Bureau of College Evaluation, The State Education Department, Albany, New York

Editor's Note. Sometime in March, the Middle States Commission is expected to take formal action on re-accreditation of the Stony Brook campus, something that happens only once a decade. This action will be based on a report from the Middle States team that visited the campus in December. The team's report has now been submitted to the University and to the Middle States Commission. An institutional response to it must be submitted to Middle States within the next few weeks, to be considered in conjunction with the report as the Commission acts on the University's re-accreditation. Meanwhile, pending that full response, President Toll has expressed appreciation of "the report's overall perspective and spirit."

"The team took our self-study ("Stony Brook in Transition," the self-critical report prepared by the University for the team's visit) very seriously," President Toll said this week. "Their report focuses on areas where the University can be improved. Clarifications will be necessary regarding certain points when our institutional response is prepared. However, in general, the report represents a very useful, constructive document that should be worthwhile reading for everyone on campus as we seek to improve our academic community."

In an effort to increase the report's usefulness to the University community, President Toll has asked that it be circulated and discussed widely on campus now, even though its formal adoption by the Middle States Commission has not yet occurred. "Statesman", therefore, presents a report on the Middle States findings in their issue of today. And, to supplement that coverage, "This Week" offers the complete text of this once-a-decade document below.

PREFACE

"Stony Brook in Transition" is well chosen as the title of the Report on the Self-Study of the University, for your institution is indeed at a turning point in moving from its original, unitary mission to a more comprehensive and complex task. It is very important for the institution at such a time to subject itself to a searching and critical self-study, and indeed you have undertaken this with excellent initial results. It is useful, as well, to obtain the views of a group of objective outsiders whose comments and recommendations can help in focusing the attention and the energy of the institution on the most critical issues it faces.

It is in this spirit -- fully consistent with the basic principle of the Middle States Association that the goal of the accreditation process is to assist the institution in meeting its educational goals -- that the evaluation team visit was undertaken, and that this report is written.

The team spent two and a half days on your campus in a visit which, despite its intensity, can only provide a general and somewhat fragmentary impression. Members of the team reviewed and discussed with a large number of students, faculty, and administrators many specific aspects of the University, as well as its general situation. Although this left several areas not covered or inadequately explored, a number of clear impressions and assessments emerged. Many of these correspond to findings of the Self-Study Report; some pertain to aspects not covered there.

Before leaving the campus, the evaluation team had an opportunity to provide a comprehensive oral summary to President Toll, Vice Presidents Pond and Gelber, and to Dr. Katz, chairman of the University's own research group in Human Development and Educational Policy, and to receive from them some immediate feedback as to possible misconceptions or errors in the team's reaction. This written report of the evaluation team elaborates on the oral summary and makes it a matter of record. Again, we wish to emphasize that the purpose of this report is to complement that of the Self-Study in focusing the attention of the institution on the principal challenges and opportunities which it faces, and to help it in its continued tackling of these issues. To this end, we hope that the Evaluation Team Report, like the Self-Study Report, will be widely distributed within the institution so as to stimulate ongoing discussion, review, and action. In this way we may be able to make a modest contribution to the admirable efforts of Stony Brook to be as successful in its present transition as it has been in the first phase of its growth.

INTRODUCTION

The initial mission of the State University of New York at Stony Brook was to become an institution of national stature in the time-honored and traditional terms of the outstanding private universities and of such public institutions as Berkeley, Michigan, and Illinois. In this it has succeeded outstandingly well. It is remarkable in what short a time Stony Brook has come to be thought of as being among that distinguished company. In less than a decade it has assembled a faculty which ranges from good to outstanding. Several departments rank among the top in the country, and most are of a very high level of quality as measured in terms of professional reputation and scholarly activities. The high intellectual calibre and standards as well as the comparative youth of the faculty has resulted in considerable accomplishments in those areas which have always been considered the hallmarks of such national institutions: basic research and related professional activities, particularly as defined within the disciplines; Ph.D. programs, especially those aimed at the education of future academics and research scholars; and undergraduate curricula, again, primarily focused on the preparation of those students who intend to pursue post-baccalaureate graduate and professional work.

This set of goals, closely related to each other, has from the beginning been perceived and accepted by the faculty as well as the administration as "the primary and proper one for the institution." The focus of development has now shifted to a set of new and more comprehensive tasks. These include the admission, with full credit for prior work satisfactorily completed, of all students graduating from transfer programs in community colleges, the tackling of vast new educational needs through continuing education and other ways of extending the university beyond its traditional limitations and, closely related to that, a growing emphasis in research and in public service on the applied problems and issues of contemporary society, particularly as they exist in the region which must be served by a university.

Though these additional objectives had always been implicit in the Master Plan for the State University generally, and for Stony Brook specifically, they had never been fully realized nor fully articulated until the very recent past. Stony Brook, as most similar institutions throughout the country, must now face up to the consequences of demographic, economic, and political changes in this country which have forced themselves onto the attention of higher education during the past two years.

It is not surprising, therefore, that this more comprehensive mission for the University has not as yet been fully realized, let alone been widely accepted, by the majority of the members of the Stony Brook community. As a result, the institution faces -- and indeed has begun to tackle -- a two-fold task. It must first fully communicate internally the additional missions and directions of the university so as to make everyone, at all levels of administration, faculty, and student body, fully aware not only of the complexity but also of the opportunities lying ahead. Only then can the institution address itself to the external needs and challenges as a common task, not equally welcomed by all, perhaps regretted by some, but recognized by everyone as something to be faced together. This is essential to marshalling the full and outstanding potential of the university.

The report of the evaluation team will reflect the nature of the transition which the institution is undergoing by addressing itself first to the principal components of the original mission: research, graduate instruction, and traditional undergraduate education. From there the report will turn to the less traditional populations which the university has begun to teach: minority students, transfer students, and those served by the Continuing Education Division. In turn, this will be followed by a summary of the team's impressions and findings regarding the institution-wide issues forming the background against which all of the university's mission must be carried out: the general environment, the quality of life, the organization, governance and administration of the institution, including academic personnel procedures as well as academic services, and finally the relation of the institution to Albany.

RESEARCH

STONY BROOK IS TO BE COMMENDED FOR ITS STRONG PROGRAM OF RESEARCH, WHICH IN TURN REFLECTS THE HIGH PROFESSIONAL CALIBRE OF THE VAST MAJORITY OF ITS FACULTY. Some 90% of the faculty engage in research leading to publication, and much of this is supported by external grants and contracts. It is eloquent testimony to the quality of this work that even after the beginning of nation-wide cutback in research support, Stony Brook in Fiscal 1972 received approximately 11% more than in the previous year.

As is to be expected from the original priorities of the university, the bulk of the research activity is in basic areas, mostly along traditional lines and within disciplinary boundaries. In recent years, however, there has been

growing interest in more applied projects, some of which, by their very nature, have also encouraged greater interdisciplinary collaboration. Both the need and the potential for this are very great, and the university is in an excellent position to make major contributions in policy and problem-oriented research of regional as well as national importance.

The area of research is not without its problems. Again and again, individual faculty members complained about the amount of paperwork involved in obtaining equipment and supplies. The obvious and necessary accountability of the institution to the state has, in some instances, led to an increase and at times duplication of bureaucratic procedures which many faculty members consider to be unnecessarily detailed and burdensome. Much of this feeling on the part of faculty undoubtedly results from their lack of understanding of the ground rules and of the place of the University in a state-wide system, and this in turn reflects inadequate internal communication. The institution might be well served not only to review its procedures so as to simplify them as much as possible, but also to intensify its attempts to disseminate information and explanation among the faculty.

Improvement also appears possible in the area of policy statements which do not always recognize that different disciplines execute research in different ways and through groups that are much different in size. Wherever possible, policies should be framed to accommodate all of the necessary variations.

Perhaps the most important problem in the area of research -- and one, though not unique to Stony Brook, is particularly acute here because of rapid expansion and major expenditures on equipment in recent years -- is that of funds both for the maintenance of equipment and for its replacement when it becomes obsolete. The advancing technology in recent years has led to complex and expensive equipment that has greatly multiplied the opportunities for research. Such equipment has to be serviced from time to time if it is to function properly, and the costs of such service has skyrocketed, whether it is provided by an outside agency or within the University itself. Adequate funds must be provided in the budget for this, as well as for replacement of equipment. Rapid obsolescence of existing devices and the continuing development of much improved models limits the useful lifetime of much research equipment to a small number of years. This may present serious problems for Stony Brook in the near future.

Although the evaluation team did not study the computer situation in any detail, it received the impression that many faculty members seek improvement in the availability of computers for academic purposes.

GRADUATE INSTRUCTION

In this area, as for that matter also in research and in undergraduate instruction, the team did not make any detailed evaluation of individual disciplines and programs. Instead, it attempted to gain certain overall impressions, germane to its review of the institution as a whole. Paramount among these is the sense that in a relatively short time, Stony Brook has managed to develop excellent graduate programs in a large number of disciplines, and that this constitutes a strong and at times dominant focus for the institutional efforts of most departments.

Thus far, the development of interdepartmental and multi-disciplinary graduate programs has lagged, with one or two notable exceptions. Some very interesting possibilities are being discussed. It seems that the team feels that this should be strongly encouraged, as should be the development of degree programs other than the Ph.D. In general, as in so many other similar institutions, the primary emphasis of graduate instruction is on full-time candidates for the doctoral degree in the basic disciplines. Of course the need to move beyond this task is intimately related to the broadening of the mission in the University as a whole, and more will be said about this in later sections.

The development of new program directions and greater emphasis on part-time students and on terminal masters' degrees is essential if the institution is to meet its enrollment projections, which call for continuing substantial growth in its graduate population. In view of the current need to limit enrollment in traditional curricula, much growth must derive from new populations and new programs.

The team shares the feeling of many members of the University community that graduate assistantships and traineeships should be geared to the teaching load of a department rather than to the number of graduate students it has. While such stipends obviously have the very important role of providing financial support for graduate students, their pertinence to the institutional teaching effort should be more clearly recognized. At the moment, e.g., such assistantships are often awarded on the basis of need and of scholarly competence more than on the basis of teaching ability, and as a result, the quality of instruction by TA's is not always satisfactory.

Of course, this is part of the larger problem -- all too common throughout this country -- that although a large population of graduate students intend to make teaching their career, systematic preparation for this task does not constitute part of their graduate education. The team here can add little and only endorse the pertinent statements in the Self-Study Report.

In addition to the questions about the manner and the priorities for the distribution of stipends, there is a very general feeling that the stipends are, at best, marginal for adequate survival, particularly for married graduate students. This problem is aggravated by the severe shortage of low-cost housing, either on or off campus, particularly for such married students. The housing available for single graduate students is subject to the same criticisms with regard to the quality of the environment and the low-level of maintenance which will be discussed in subsequent sections of this report.

A final recommendation concerns that of the need for advising and other support services for graduate students. Given a growing heterogeneity of the graduate student body, accompanied at the same time by a dwindling of the

traditional academic job market which is the one best known to the faculty, it becomes increasingly inadequate to rely entirely on the individual faculty member or the department to provide the graduate students with the necessary advice both as to their curriculum and as to their later placement. Here again, the issue is part of a broader problem affecting students at all levels, in which the graduate students are often overlooked. In the years to come, they will be as much in need of academic advising, placement services, and related support as are undergraduate students. By the same token, as graduate study becomes increasingly something different from a faculty member training someone in his or her own image, the quality of instruction and the necessary pedagogic skills become an issue at the post-baccalaureate level as they already are in the undergraduate education. There exists, at both levels, not so much the problem of a sharp dichotomy between "two Stony Brooks", but rather the urgent need for the institution to recognize and to accommodate itself to the existence of a much broader and more varied spectrum of students than had been implied in the original mission.

UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION

In this area, even more than at the graduate level, the team was struck by the paramount need for the University to respond to the needs of a full spectrum of students, of which those intending to go on to full-time graduate studies as doctoral candidates form only a relatively small minority. The University, mindful of its original mission, has with great success assembled a faculty of research-oriented scholars. This faculty is obviously best matched to those students who will follow the same career. The general impression of the evaluation team is that on the whole, the undergraduate curricula for prospective majors and future graduate students range from sound to outstanding. The sequence of courses and the individual offerings are, in general, rather conventional, with less innovation or even idiosyncratic individuality than one would expect in a young institution, but the University has been clearly successful in developing courses of study of solid and traditional quality.

If the match here is successful, it is less so for all other students. There are some doubts in the minds of the team as to the appropriateness of the "two Stony Brooks" image, and concern that this can easily become a self-fulfilling prophecy. The range of student interests and potential is really a continuous one, not a sharply bifurcated one, and this in fact is a source of great potential strength. The basic belief of Stony Brook's administration that a single faculty can, in the aggregate, meet the needs of all students is likely to be sound precisely because of the continuous spectrum and mix of students and, for that matter, because most individual students combine within themselves a variety of degrees of interest and motivation.

In view of this, the evaluation team strongly endorses the institutional commitment to meeting multi-purpose needs with a single, unified faculty. Such a match is indeed both desirable and possible. However, it will not happen automatically, and the principal purpose of this report is to help focus attention on areas requiring change and adaptation, and to make some suggestions as to their accomplishment.

1) FACULTY DEVELOPMENT: A Faculty recruited for its interests and accomplishments in research and advanced graduate instruction in traditional doctoral programs needs help and support in making the transition to more varied tasks. This is particularly important if the change is perceived as involuntary and externally imposed. There must exist very clear rewards for the time and effort devoted to this redeployment, and all pertinent means should be used to provide guidance and encouragement in meeting the new demands.

2) For virtually all students except those whose professional goals match them fully and securely to a highly structured curriculum (such as in the hard sciences), there is great need for more and better advising and related support services. While this is particularly for students who have as yet not declared majors, it is important as well for those whose career aims are not uniquely matched to the professional emphasis of a discipline.

3) The rapid increase in transfer students from community colleges has become to many faculty the paramount symbol and issue in Stony Brook's move toward becoming a multi-purpose University. The Self-Study Report addresses itself to this in considerable detail, and the matter arises in virtually every discussion on campus.

The prevalent perception is that of a large number of students admitted automatically, with much lower initial aptitude than those of the "indigenous students" who were admitted as freshmen. The transfer students, most faculty believe, are then further disadvantaged by a lower standard of instruction in their community colleges. Most of the faculty are convinced that as a result there is a perceptible and permanent difference between the transfer and the indigenous students. However, it is not at all clear whether this impression corresponds to the facts. There is reason to believe that after overcoming the culture shock of the first transfer semester, students from community colleges perform in ways not distinguishable from those who entered as freshmen. It is essential to obtain more information about this and, if indeed there is a gap between myth and reality, to eliminate this promptly. There is great danger in perpetuating a potentially wrong image which is very likely to prove to be self-fulfilling if not corrected.

However, given the prevalent assessment of the problem, much more needs to be done on an institutional basis to cope with it. A number of steps suggest themselves as imperative:

a) In view of the fact that the vast majority of transfer students come from only two community colleges (Suffolk and Nassau), much more contact is possible between these feeder institutions and Stony Brook. Considerably greater effort should be devoted to bringing together the faculties in these institutions and Stony Brook to discuss curricula and to improve articulation. That this has been done successfully by a few departments shows what can be done in general.

b) The proximity of those two community colleges makes it unusually simple to be in touch with prospective transfer students long before they come to Stony Brook. Activities such as visits by faculty teams and staff to the community colleges, "open house" days and other kinds of visits to Stony Brook, and a pre-registration orientation in the spring prior to transfer are all relatively easy and should be intensified.

c) The experience of many colleges with able but disadvantaged students at the freshman level has shown that it is possible to develop transitional courses which start at a point lower than conventional ones but which, through intensive coverage, reach ultimately the same level. Such courses should be developed for transfer students in all departments which consider the community college preparation to be inadequate.

d) Contact with community colleges might be improved, and at the same time, a significant contribution both to the education and the support of graduate students might be found through intensive exploration of the increased use of Stony Brook graduate students as part-time instructors at the nearby community colleges.

The team report lists these specific items as examples of possible actions because it is obvious even to the most casual observer that Stony Brook must intensify its efforts to accommodate itself to the reality of admitting transfer students. The issue is of such importance that it might be well to have a full-time staff member in the office of the academic vice president, charged with the stimulation and coordination of all transfer student oriented efforts.

The team is aware that the situation with regard to transfer students, or at least the faculty perception of it, may be influenced by the fact that the majority of such students enter those departments which already are overcrowded and understaffed. This leads both to actual pedagogic problems as well as to resentment by the already overloaded faculty.

3) MINORITY STUDENTS: Adequate advising, orientation, support services, and a general sense of institutional concern are important for all students. However, they become matters of basic survival for students who are marginal because of prior educational disadvantages. Not all of these are minority students nor are all minority students disadvantaged. But there is a sufficient degree of congruence between these two categories at Stony Brook that one can state generally that the obstacles and difficulties existing for undergraduate students generally at this institution are much more serious for minority groups.

CONTINUING EDUCATION

The continuing education activities at Stony Brook are in a healthy and critical state of flux. Until now, continuing education, by design, has been limited in scope so as to allow the institution to concentrate on on-campus undergraduate and graduate programs which must necessarily form the base for any institutional activities in continuing education. This is especially valid because the institution has committed itself to the difficult but highly desirable principle that the same faculty which provides the basic on-campus instruction should also be responsible for extension and continuing education.

The time is now ripe, both as a result of the state of development reached by Stony Brook and because of the rapidly growing need to reach non-traditional students in non-traditional ways, to give highest priority to a concerted and full-fledged attention to this category of institutional activity.

The main emphasis to date has been on an interdisciplinary master's program which has grown very rapidly to very large enrollment because of its great appeal to teachers. The institution is to be commended for meeting the needs of this professional group but is now at a point where it must broaden the programmatic scope of continuing education and must, as well, provide an appropriate administrative and conceptual framework. In particular, there is great need to formulate and articulate institutional philosophy, spelling out the future directions, goals, and missions of continuing education. This in turn should lead to establishing an appropriate institution-wide administrative structure for the implementation of future plans, as well as to proper evaluation of continuing education efforts. Furthermore, and most importantly, it is essential to provide adequate staff for the necessary administrative and support services. It is implicit in the "one faculty" principle that continuing education is basically a "delivery mechanism", a way of making available pedagogic and professional resources of the University to the extended clientele. From this it follows that on the one hand continuing education must have the necessary non-academic staff to accomplish this, but that, by the same token, academic matters must remain the responsibility of the appropriate academic units who also supply the necessary academic resources. The present practice of establishing so-called continuing education lines in departmental budgets is a questionable practice in that it tends to separate and isolate this activity. It would be better if the departmental budgets be based on the total, integrated teaching and service load of the department, with continuing education and extension activities forming part of the same total as on-campus graduate and undergraduate instruction.

It follows from this as well that it is necessary to involve a broad spectrum of faculty in determining the future philosophy, policies, goals, and objectives in continuing education. Only in this way can continuing and external education become an integral part of the institutional mission, and can maximum use be made of the resources and interests of the current faculty.

In terms of the individual faculty member, it is necessary that participation in continuing education and extension efforts be considered as part of the total teaching load and that promotion and tenure policies and procedures give due recognition to this. Indeed, this has begun to be the case in many instances.

Furthermore, if continuing education is to move from being a distinct and peripheral activity to becoming part of a multi-dimensional continuum link-

ing all manner of on-and-off-campus instruction and professional activities it follows that Student Affairs and Student Services must increasingly address themselves to meeting the needs of older, and part-time students in addition to their traditional tasks.

The team is impressed by the enormous potential of Stony Brook as a major intellectual resource for its region and by the considerable progress which has already been made in bringing this to fruition. In addition to the interdisciplinary master's curriculum already mentioned, there are a number of excellent programs underway in various units within the University, particularly in engineering and in the health sciences. Furthermore, through the concept and practice of the "one faculty", Stony Brook has taken a major step which many other institutions would be well to copy. If a proper planning and organizational effort is made at this time, with full faculty involvement and broad institutional support, Stony Brook can indeed become the national model in showing how a major university can extend its full range of resources in research, service, and teaching to help meet the needs of its regional constituency.

THE QUALITY OF LIFE AND THE ENVIRONMENT

An institution in which all constituents share a common mission and purpose can expect its members, at least up to a certain point, to put up with inadequate services and a poor environment during the pioneering years of early growth. The exhilaration of being at the Frontier compensates for many temporary hardships and inconveniences. It is with this in mind that the administration of Stony Brook used as much of the available resources as possible for the rapid construction of buildings and the equally speedy buildup of the faculty. The time for esthetic considerations and personal amenities would come when the target for growth had been approached.

The strategy never took into consideration that long-term goals, even if shared by faculty and administration, are of little benefit to a student due to spend only four years or less on campus. Furthermore, even for a dedicated faculty enthusiastic about institutional goals, certain continuing inconveniences can become a growing source of irritations.

The situation has in recent years become much more serious because of the transition of Stony Brook to the more comprehensive and complex goals of a multi-purpose university, and the general inadequacy of communication and lack of internalization of these new missions. As a result, the quality of life at Stony Brook -- or rather the lack of it -- has become a major source of concern requiring immediate attention and effective remediation. The environment, both exterior and interior, is little short of disastrous and can no longer be blamed on ongoing construction. The maintenance in the buildings is very poor, and the lack of exterior landscaping and groundkeeping is very disturbing. It is not so much a question of the intrinsic importance of such matters, although one would argue that an esthetic sense of environment might be considered as part of a liberal education. More important, however, is that the state of the campus has always been perceived by students and is seen increasingly by the faculty as a signal that the institution does not particularly care about their welfare and pays little attention to their opinions. Thus, the quality of life in the environment looms as a serious problem of faculty as well as student morale.

The University administration clearly and correctly recognizes that the early emphasis on the hard sciences and on related subjects has created an imbalance which must be rectified by considerable additional facilities and the allocation of resources to the humanities and to the social sciences. By the same token, the initial decision to concentrate on rapid human and physical growth now must be balanced by concentrated attention on the environment in which the University must exist.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

1) INTERNAL ACADEMIC ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

This is an area of concern to the team because there appears to be a considerable dichotomy between what actually exists and what many members of the Stony Brook community perceive as existing. Stony Brook has moved throughout its short history to develop an academic administration which is flexible and responsive to change, but which, given the complex nature of the University, is itself necessarily complex. In particular, the Vice Presidents responsible for the principal academic areas (health sciences, liberal arts) have a direct reporting relationship to the President and Executive Vice President while at the same time having a functional relationship, in the appropriate areas, to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Finance and Management respectively. This structure appears to work quite well, in part as a result of the high caliber and the pronounced degree of mutual trust and good will on the part of the chief administrators, but the relationships and the primary responsibilities are not sufficiently well understood by all lower administrative echelons - particularly some department chairmen - or all faculty and students. There is great need to disseminate clearly and probably more than once - pertinent and accurate information about the administrative structure and its detailed functioning to those members of the community who need it most. Department chairmen in particular need to know better where to go for help or for decisions on specific matters. To many of them the budget, how it is developed, where fiscal decisions are made, and underlying rationales appear to be unnecessarily obscure.

These comments are intended to emphasize the need for better communication and exchange of information so as to provide the faculty with a more accurate perception of what the administration does, and how it is put together to serve the academic community. In particular, the functional responsibility of the academic vice president, under the president and executive vice president, for all academic matters should be made quite unambiguous. With regard to the internal organization of the liberal arts - in terms of deans, provosts, and the like - there are a number of equally valid answers.

The team has no recommendation of this except to emphasize that the institution should decide promptly what it wants to do in this area, communicate the decision clearly and widely, and move to implement it promptly. All in all, it is the administration's responsibility to increase dramatically and promptly the level of two-way communication between itself and the faculty and in particular between the vice presidents and department chairmen.

2) CAMPUS GOVERNANCE

The present inadequacy of communication, remarkable considering the relative youth of the institution and its still modest size, is undoubtedly aggravated by the absence of campus governance. The Faculty Senate now operates essentially through its standing committees, which do an excellent job and are generally effective, but which cannot by themselves constitute a full governance mechanism. The team is aware that this has been a subject of much activity and a source of great frustration for some time. The faculty has failed in three successive attempts to organize itself into a representative body and appears now to verge on a final and hopefully successful attempt. The team does not presume to recommend any specific model, but wishes to emphasize its serious concern with the present situation and its feeling that **absence of a fully effective campus governance is a serious handicap for the institution and has a significantly negative effect on the morale and attitudes of many faculty and students.**

At Stony Brook, as in many other institutions at this time, the faculty feel threatened by new external pressures, by the austerity of anticipated budgets, by new questions as to the purposes and markets for higher education and research, and by the anomalous moods of students and surrounding communities. This is aggravated at Stony Brook because many faculty feel unrepresented and uninvolved in institutional decisions. The team recognizes that to some extent this would be the case regardless of the effectiveness of any campus governance and no matter how much emphasis were given to communication between the faculty and administration. During the period of intensive and rapid development, the attention of most faculty members and in particular of the department chairmen were inevitably focused on their own department and discipline, with little attention and energy left over for the concerns of other departments, let alone for that of the institution as a whole. Nevertheless, this has, in our opinion, been unduly aggravated by nonexistent governance and inadequate communications.

As a result, the multipurpose mission of the University has simply not been internalized by the vast majority of the faculty. The need to admit transfer students and to relate to the regional needs through continuing education, applied research, and public service, are perceived as dictated from outside and/or above and as being non-academic and threatening in nature. There is a critical need for decisive institutional leadership in defining and internalizing what is now perceived as external and extra-academic concerns with new students, regional responsibilities, and public service. **The whole machinery of middle level management, particularly deans and department heads, must participate in conveying these new missions to the faculty. Then, the faculty as a whole as well as the whole range of departments must participate in translating such missions into institutional practices.** In turn this must be accompanied by the commitments of such resources, sanctions and incentives as are needed to make sure that this is possible and effective.

The strong emphasis on the need to develop better communication and greater faculty participation in translating institutional goals into actual practice, already stressed in the discussion on continuing education, pervades much of this report and is based on the team's recognition of and admiration for Stony Brook's extraordinary strengths and potential. Stony Brook has become such an outstanding institution in so short a time and has such boundless potential to meet the critical needs of the coming decades that any group of outside observers must necessarily feel a sense of great urgency about removing those barriers and improving those conditions which at the moment inhibit this development. The better an institution is, the more important does this become. The team also recognizes the paradox that the very strong emphasis on departmental development which made possible the existing strength of the institution is now to some extent a barrier to what is essential in the next stage: cross-departmental and institution-wide emphasis on curricular development and innovation, problem and policy oriented research and service, and above all, a sense of common purpose.

3) THE RELATION OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES

There is no better example of the importance of proper organization and effective communication than the enormous potential which the University has in the health sciences. Here Stony Brook has made the excellent and wise decision to maintain the closest possible relation between this area and all other University disciplines, and this has the possibility of making the whole much greater than the sum of the parts. Already there exists, in actuality or in the planning stage, interdisciplinary programs, common research projects, and a host of other activities relating to the health sciences to the remainder of the University. The potential for this is very great, but it cannot be fully realized without recognizing and removing existing obstacles to complete integration. These include inadequate understanding of the administrative structure and the lack of effective campus-wide governance. The team further recommends that there be as much symmetry as possible between the health sciences and the other principal academic areas in faculty personnel procedures, program review, and other academic matters.

4) ACADEMIC PERSONNEL PROCEDURES

The Faculty Senate's Committee on Personnel Policy appears to be doing a very good job in advising the administration on appointments and promotions which involve tenure. Serious consideration should be given to extending the advisory review to non-tenure decisions as well. In the years to come, campus-wide, trans-departmental needs and perspectives will have to be taken increasingly into consideration both in new appointments as well as in reappointments not involving tenure. For this purpose as well, there is great need for a clearer delineation of institutional policy and criteria for reappointments and tenure which properly take into account the multi-purpose mission of the University. There exist at present considerable ambiguity and different perceptions, especially among younger faculty members whose future is critically affected by the standards and effectiveness of the institutional reward system. The transition which Stony Brook is undergoing, the apparent divergence between the reasons for which the faculty was initially hired and the present institutional priorities, and fears about the consequences of a stabilizing faculty size all contribute to considerable unease on the part of the faculty. Here again, the need for clarification and communication is paramount.

5) STUDENT AFFAIRS AND SERVICES

This part of the institutional organization has been greatly handicapped by a protracted period without a permanent vice president for student affairs. The team notes with relief that this vacancy has been long last filled. No one holding a senior position in a temporary and acting capacity, no matter how capable, can fully provide effective leadership within the division, particularly for a young and inexperienced staff, nor adequately establish the role and

importance of student affairs in the eyes of students, faculty, or administration.

The arrival of the new vice president for student affairs should be the occasion of a thorough review and reassessment of the organization of that division, its priorities, and its staffing. The team recommends that this be done with the help of outside consultants who could bring to the situation both the necessary expertise and objectivity.

Among the issues to be reviewed are whether admissions and registration, with its strong academic implications, should remain organizationally within the division of student affairs. Attention should also be given to the proper administrative locus for housing and food service. While obviously all of these functions affect student lives in a very direct fashion and must therefore be of great concern to those responsible for student affairs, their day-to-day administration is a major burden which may well deflect the energies and attention of the student affairs staff from other areas requiring its attention. Among these is counseling, which requires more outreach, a mechanism for crisis intervention, and more opportunities for earlier referral of psychiatric problems. There is need as well for better career counseling, and for closer coordination of the residential staff into the overall advising and counseling program. Much improvement is needed also in the health services, with particular emphasis on gynecological and other services aimed particularly at women students. In this general connection it should be noted that the use of graduate students from the School of Social Work is an excellent idea, but that this must happen under the supervision of competent, well-trained professional staff, adequate in numbers. With that, a student health center, a college residence, and the like can be most effective field work placements for professional training. Properly directed advance students can then be most effective in reaching and helping undergraduates.

The area of student government is of course closely related to that of student affairs and urgently requires constructive attention by the new vice president and appropriate staff. The existing Student Polity can be made more effective, and student input into the institutional decision-making process expanded beyond membership on a number of committees. Questions can also be raised about the relatively few persons making decisions about the very large sums available from student fees, and the comparatively high administrative cost of this operation.

LIBRARY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

An observer cannot help but be deeply impressed by the progress made by Stony Brook in developing a true university library, capable of serving sophisticated graduate programs in a variety of disciplines, many undergraduate programs, and the growing activity in continuing education. The institution can take pride in this effort to date which represents a phenomenal growth within a very short time.

The necessity to grow so rapidly has exerted great pressures upon the library's administrative officers, its staff, and the faculty library committee. All have made a remarkable contribution to the University's academic community.

In the early and formative years the University and the library authorities have properly given top priority to the development of the collection. This is reflected in the composition of the library staff, with emphasis given to the technical processing activities, such as acquisition, cataloging and classification of materials. **Obviously, these vital functions need to continue, but it is now necessary to achieve a more balanced effort over the next several years between them and those more directed toward readers' services.** This necessity is fully appreciated by the library administration and by the faculty advisory committee, and is reflected in the budget requests currently being submitted. The University library is a complex organism generally reflecting as a microcosm the macrocosm that is a university's academic personality. The Stony Brook Library, as also the institution as a whole, has thus far placed the greatest priority on rapid growth and on high intrinsic quality. This, institutionally as well as in the library, must now be supplemented by a strong service orientation. Specifically it means that the library must develop a readers' services staff of sufficient size and competence to make it possible for all members of the multi-purpose university and for the region which the University serves to use its ever-growing resources effectively.

The announced appointment of a new director of libraries augurs well for the library's future. The time is ripe for strong leadership to emanate from the office of the director. Such leadership is essential if the library is to serve the University and the region effectively. Essential for this, as well, is a continuation of adequate budgetary support for the library operation.

The need for a strong readers' services staff is intensified by the size and the complexity of the main library building, which many users find impersonal, compartmentalized, and confusing.

The University, like many of its sister institutions, also faces the issue of branch libraries, of which at the moment there exist five. The advantages as well as the disadvantages of these are equally and too finely balanced for the team to make a recommendation as to consolidation on the basis of such a short visit. However, the most serious consideration should be given to making the director of libraries responsible for the totality of library holdings, regardless of their location, and including future as well as existing collections. This would seem essential to achieve optimal use of limited resources and a full coordination and compatibility of all parts of the system.

The team would also encourage continuing and ever closer coordination of the libraries with service agencies such as the instructional resources center. The existing interrelation and the potential for its growth are obvious, especially in view of the encouraging moves toward computerized cataloging and retrieval systems involving large groups of institutions.

With regard to administrative services, the team's impressions are far less positive than with regard to the library. There is widespread dissatisfaction among both faculty and students, and although this is not uncommon in major institutions, it appears to be particularly strong and seemingly well founded at Stony Brook. Again, this is clearly in part of a consequence of rapid growth, but the institution has existed long enough for the shake-down period to near its end. Part of the problem if indeed there is one, may lie in the organizational location of some key academic services. The responsibility of Student Affairs for registration, and the direct responsibility of the executive vice president for the computing center, may make it difficult for these services to be fully sensitive and responsive to academic needs, and the team recommends that these relationships be reviewed.

INSTITUTIONAL IMBALANCE BETWEEN THE SCIENCES AND OTHER FIELDS

The administration of Stony Brook is fully aware of and deeply concerned about the existing imbalance between the resources as well as the physical

facilities of the sciences and related subjects on the one hand and the social sciences and humanities on the other. The strategy of development for Stony Brook was, and continues to be, based on a period of continuous growth which would last through the '70's. The initial emphasis during the first decade was given to the rapid growth of the sciences, particularly in terms of their extensive and necessarily expensive facilities, with the corresponding growth and proper accommodations for the other fields to become the main priority during the second decade of institutional development.

The team strongly concurs with Stony Brook's administration in attaching great urgency and importance to continuing growth as essential to establishing the proper balance among the major groups of disciplines. Such balance is essential for two reasons. In the first place, the basic quality of the institution as a major resource for research, instruction, and public service depends as crucially on the social sciences and the humanities as it does on the "harder" fields. The education of an effective participant in the contemporary world in any capacity requires a thorough understanding of social, political and economic factors, and furthermore, the most important research in matters of public concern and policy increasingly requires the joint and simultaneous application of all parts of the intellectual spectrum.

The second important reason for the need to bring about a better balance among the disciplines at Stony Brook is that, at this time, there is a pervasive and debilitating feeling among the social scientists and humanists on campus that they are second class citizens. There are a number of ways of categorizing the institution in terms of "two Stony Brooks", and of these the most valid seems to be the dichotomy between the hard sciences on the one hand and the social sciences and humanities on the other. The faculty in the latter feel on the whole disadvantaged and overworked, and there appears to be a good deal of truth in this on a comparative basis. Furthermore, as has been mentioned elsewhere, the situation may be aggravated by the danger that the principal burden of some of the University's new missions may be falling precisely on those areas which already feel as having the short end of the stick. The majority of transfer students take courses and major in these fields, further increasing their load. Furthermore, as was pointed out in the Self-Study Report, both for transfer students and for those admitted as freshmen, there is some sense that the social sciences and the humanities are somehow second best and a haven for those who do not make it in the other fields.

It should be emphasized that these feelings of being the institutional poor relations seem to exist on a collective but not on an individual basis. Individual members of departments in the social sciences and humanities consider themselves -- and with great justification -- as the intellectual equals of their scientific and technical colleagues. It is as departmental groups that they view the disparity.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The record of the University to date with regard to affirmative action leaves much to be desired. **A continuing vigorous and imaginative effort is needed both in the recruiting of minority students and in implementing affirmative action for staff and faculty.** In this, the example set by the University's central administration is of the utmost importance. At the time of the team's visit, prior to the arrival of the new, female vice president for student affairs, every single senior official of the University with whom the team had any contact was a white male. Under such conditions, the administration has little credibility and less influence when it urges departments to recruit more women and more minorities.

RELATIONSHIP TO SUNY CENTRAL AND STATE AGENCIES

Stony Brook is part of a massive university system, and in addition relates to ten or more state agencies with educational, budgetary, regulatory, or legislative responsibilities. As a result, and by necessity, considerable amount of time of administrators as well as of faculty are spent in clearing matters with either SUNY Central and/or one or more state agencies. The team's efforts and report pertain primarily to the inner workings of the University, and an exploration in depth of the external relationships must be left to the separate review of SUNY Central by the Commission. On the basis of our observation, however, we would offer the following remarks:

There is little indication for the need for any fundamental qualitative changes IN KIND in the University's relationship to SUNY Central or to various state agencies. However, it would be worth reviewing possible changes IN DEGREE, particularly with regard to the magnitude and the importance of decisions and implementations which at the moment require some form of central review. The budgetary and legislative responsibility of Central State agencies and the final authority of SUNY Central would not be impaired, and administrative efficiency at all levels could be improved, if more details with regard to resource allocations and priorities could be left to the individual universities within system-wide policy statements and guidelines. It would appear that at this time too much detail requires central review and decisions, be it in the use of relatively small funds, even though these are available in the budget, or in the redefinition of administrative responsibilities, even if this does not require additional positions or changes in salary.

The team also feels that the inadequacy of internal communication at Stony Brook, faculty confusion about the campus administrative organization, and the absence of effective governance contribute to a greater than usual suspicion and lack of understanding by the faculty and the students of the role and of the responsibilities of state-wide agencies. Here too a considerable informational effort would be indicated.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The team, in submitting this report to you, is very much aware of the imbalance of these comments. They are not meant to provide a complete and inclusive appraisal of your institution, which would include description and praise for the great strengths and outstanding achievements of Stony Brook which far outweigh its problems and weaknesses. In focusing on the latter, the team is attempting to help you in removing or at least lowering those barriers which still prevent the full realization of the University's extraordinary potential.

American higher education today faces challenges and opportunities during the coming decade which are far more difficult but also far more promising than the enormous growth of the past twenty years. **Among the major public universities, Stony Brook stands out in terms of its potential to accomplish the multipurpose mission which lies ahead, and deserves high praise for its efforts to date. The team hopes that the critical comments in this report will help you in your further progress.**

In conclusion, we would like to thank all members of the student body, the faculty, the administration, and the Trustees who met with us for their warm hospitality and their help in making our visit informative.