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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

As an introduction to our self-study report, this chapter provides a brief, historical overview of Teachers College, particularly with respect to the evolution of its mission. It also offers a snapshot of key current institutional characteristics and, as a core component of the self-study, introduces the strategic planning process that the College recently completed. Additionally, this section of our self-study report introduces the self-study design and organization, including the Steering Committee and Subcommittee teams engaged in the preparation of the reports that comprise the self-study (Appendix I-A). Lastly, an executive summary of each subsequent chapter is provided.

Historical Context

Founded in 1887 to provide a new kind of schooling for the teachers of poor, immigrant children in New York City, Teachers College to date has educated nearly 100,000 students from around the world. Teachers College became affiliated with Columbia in 1898, but remains a financially independent institution with its own president and board of trustees. Columbia University is the fifth oldest institution of higher learning in the United States and the oldest in the State of New York. As Columbia University’s graduate school of education, with curricula primarily in three broad areas: education, psychology, and health, Teachers College is both a master’s and doctoral-level graduate school, and a professional school.

Our Morningside Heights campus on West 120th Street was established in 1894. With its immediate neighbors being Columbia University, Barnard College, Manhattan School of Music, Jewish Theological Seminary, and Union Theological Seminary, Teachers College is situated in what has long been hailed as the “institutional heart” of New York City. The College is within walking distance of Riverside Park along the Hudson River, as well as Morningside Park, St. Luke’s Hospital, Riverside Church, and the Cathedral of St. John the Divine.

Teachers College is accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, and several professional associations. It consistently ranks among the nation’s top schools of education according to U.S. News and World Report.

Evolution of Mission

Teachers College is embracing its historic role as an innovator, social activist, and bold pioneer in defining and advancing the field of education with an emphasis on urban education. Though significantly evolved, the current mission of Teachers College remains closely connected to its founding principle by engaging in programs of research, teaching, and service.

Teachers College is both a professional and a graduate school. The institution has understood and responded to societal needs and created many of the fields of study that are now considered the foundations of education. Throughout its history, Teachers College has highly valued its faculty’s enduring capacity to create new knowledge and has established academic areas of concentration that are now in the curriculum of almost every school of education, including educational administration, elementary and secondary teacher education, international
and comparative education, nutrition education, and the education of the gifted. Research centers and institutes occupy a significant portion of the College’s landscape and routinely attract substantial research funding. The administration and the faculty insist on preserving the College’s place as a source of some of the most exciting thinking about education in the world. Tenure is managed rigorously, especially around the contributions of research to practitioners, policymakers, and scholars.

In 1995, Teachers College reorganized its departmental structure. In its current configuration, academic programs are organized into nine departments augmented by centers, institutes, and projects that reinforce instructional areas with research, service, and experiential initiatives. The nine multidisciplinary departments include: Arts and Humanities, Biobehavioral Sciences, Counseling and Clinical Psychology, Curriculum and Teaching, Health and Behavior Studies, Human Development, International and Transcultural Studies, Math, Science and Technology, and Organization and Leadership.¹

While Teachers College remains a premier training ground for teachers and school administrators, its institutional reach extends much further to encompass the education of psychologists, biobehavioral and behavioral scientists, health professionals, policy analysts, technologists, and internationalists. By design, Teachers College in the 21st century is a graduate and professional school of education in the broadest sense of the term—concerned with education across the lifespan in and out of the classroom and deeply engaged with society and in support of its culture. As an outcome of the strategic planning process, a new mission was formally adopted:

Teachers College is dedicated to promoting equity and excellence in education and overcoming the gap in educational access and achievement between the most and least advantaged groups in this country. Through programs of teaching, research, and service, the College draws upon the expertise of a diverse community of faculty in education, psychology, and health, as well as students and staff from across the country and around the world.

Key Institutional Characteristics

For the 2005-06 academic year, Teachers College has 154 full-time faculty on appointment. The College currently has nine searches for new faculty appointments underway, which when filled would bring the total number of faculty at the College to 167, barring retirements or other departures. Of the 154 full-time faculty on appointment, approximately 69% are tenured and all hold a doctoral or equivalent terminal degree. The distribution by rank is approximately 45% full professor, 34% associate professor, and 21% assistant professor. About 21% are of color and 60% are female. The adjunct faculty plays a significant role in bringing the reality of practice into classrooms and seminars. The faculty is scholarly, vigorous, and engaged.

The faculty place great value on their teaching in both the professional and graduate programs. They are responsible for designing and implementing the extensive range of programs offered at Teachers College, and they include students in much of their research activity as a

¹An organizational chart for the academic areas of Teachers College is provided in Chapter III.
means of providing professional development opportunities. Teachers College students also have access to many of the services, programs, and activities at Columbia University.

Today, the College enrolls 5,070 students who study in fields ranging from clinical psychology to movement sciences to curriculum and teaching. In the Fall of 2005, the students came from all parts of the United States, as well as 80-plus countries around the world. International students accounted for 13% of this year’s enrollment. Many of the international students attend with the aid of prestigious programs such as Fulbright Scholarships and International Rotary Club Scholarships, and several have received special scholarships from the ministries of education in their home countries.

The student body is unique, bringing a wealth of practical experience across widely disparate settings to their common classrooms. Nearly one-fourth of the students enrolled have had recent experience in fields other than education, and nearly 20% are over the age of 40. The median age of all students is just under 30, though the variation in age and experience covers the entire spectrum of possibility. They also come from a diverse array of ethnic and racial communities. In 2005, of U.S. citizens enrolled, over 30% were students of color and over three-quarters were women. Teachers College conferred approximately 1,700 degrees, with 12% at the doctoral level and the remaining 88% in Master of Education, Science, and Arts degrees.

From a governance perspective, the College has traditionally sought modes that provide for the effective participation of all sectors of the academic community, both in the determination of policies guiding the life of the community and also in the critical appraisal of the implementation of those policies. The primary participants in College governance include the Trustees of the College, the president and officers of the College, and the Faculty, though students and staff also play a role. The Board of Trustees currently consists of 31 members, with 35 being the maximum allowed by the College’s bylaws.

The business of the Faculty is conducted by the Faculty Executive Committee, while the department chairs are responsible for managing academic, budget, and personnel matters for each of the nine departments. Faculty provide systematic advice to senior administration in the preparation of the annual budget and make judgments concerning the extent to which the annual budget conforms with established priorities.

As it stands today, tuition and fees from students account for approximately 70% of the College’s annual operating budget. The administration has launched a series of initiatives to reduce dependency on tuition revenue, but there is still work to be done. Over the past decade, the College has created its first modern fundraising office, tripled annual fundraising, and completed the largest capital campaign ($155 million) ever on behalf of a school of education.

The financial health of the College is evidenced, in part, through its success in achieving

---

2 In 2005, the College’s principal sources of unrestricted operating revenues were student tuition and fees, representing 48% of all operating revenues, and grants and contracts for research and training programs, representing 25% of all operating revenues. Investment return, auxiliary activities, government appropriations, and other sources comprised the remaining 27% of operating revenues.
an operating surplus for 10 consecutive fiscal years. From 1996 to 2005, overall operating revenues have grown from $60.9 million to $137.9 million. The principal sources of unrestricted operating revenues are student tuition and fees, with the remaining revenue derived from grants and contracts for research and training programs, investment return, auxiliary activities, and government appropriations. The College’s largest financial asset is its endowment, with a fair market value of $168 million, as of August 31, 2005. The second largest and oldest asset is its physical plant, consisting of land, buildings, furniture and fixtures, and equipment. Over the past 10 years, approximately $80 million has been invested in capital expenditures to fund repairs and renovations, including the construction of a new dormitory and a state-of-the-art library, as well as a conference center which is in the process of being built. The improved physical plant and strong fiscal results continue to strengthen the financial base of the College in support and advancement of its mission.

Transitions and New Initiatives

When the College undertook its previous self-study, the 1996-97 academic year marked a crucial transition between the first phase of the reorganization effort, which began in the Fall 1994 term and concluded at the end of the 1995-96 academic year with the restatement of the mission of the College and the creation of nine new departments, and the second, ongoing phase of reorganization, which would focus on implementing and supporting the new academic units and the programs and students they housed. Our hope at that time was that our self-study review and the evaluation site visit this Spring would assist us in reflecting upon the progress we had made to date and in clarifying issues of organization, process, program, and support services that were essential to the ongoing success of our reorganization efforts. Additionally, we also hoped that the self-study, the site visit, and the report from the evaluation team would be a helpful starting point for the College as it undertook a “mid-course” evaluation and assessment of the reorganization process during the 1997-98 academic year.

We approach our current self-study once again in the context of important transitions in leadership, major initiatives that have been recently launched and which chart the path for the College for the coming decade. We also approach it with the hope that the self-study process and feedback from the evaluation team will again help us in reflecting upon the progress we have made to date. As we move forward, we hope thus to clarify issues of organization, process, program, and support services that are essential to the ongoing success of the strategic planning and initiatives to improve the quality of the student experience.

Academic year 2005-06 also marks several key transitions for Teachers College. Arthur Levine, appointed president of Teachers College in July, 1994, announced his decision to step down from the presidency as of July, 2006. His departure will cap a 12-year term during which the College, under his leadership, tripled its endowment; refurbished and rehabilitated its physical plant; reorganized its academic departments and strengthened its faculty and Board of Trustees; conducted the largest capital campaign ever undertaken by a graduate school of education; and, most recently, developed the Strategic Plan for Teachers College, a key component of which was the adoption of a new mission focused on educational equity.

The Strategic Plan for Teachers College addresses every aspect of the institution’s focus, programs, operations, facilities, and finances in an ambitious but realistic and flexible way. It
retains a strong focus and a set of clear institutional goals while leading the entire organization along a path of innovation, investment, expansion, and renewal. The set of 21 initiatives, which comprise the bulk of the plan, focuses on accomplishing the following institutional goals:

- We will increase the impact of Teachers College on the fields and the diverse constituencies that it serves.
- We will reestablish Teachers College as the premier school of education in fact and reputation.
- We will assure the long-term financial viability of the College.
- We will improve all aspects of the student experience.
- We will make Teachers College operate more effectively and continue to honor and cultivate diversity throughout the institution.

Institutional Focus: Educational Equity. Building on the goals articulated for the College, a first key outcome of the strategic planning process involved institutional focus. Through the restatement of its mission and the launch of the Campaign for Educational Equity, Teachers College has embarked upon a major program to address the largest problem facing education and the country: the inequity of educational opportunity across our population. Teachers College has embraced this issue as its commonality or central focus. It is a present-day extension of the very reason the College was founded: to serve the urban and disadvantaged populations of New York City that the schools of the day were so poorly assisting. It is already also the focus of much of the research and teaching of the majority of our faculty.

The College is uniquely qualified to address this issue. Educational inequality is not only an issue of excellent schooling or educational institutions. It is as much, if not more an issue of health, nutrition, families, communities, and human development. A focus on Educational Equity will bring the faculty together, knit the institution closer together across the departments, have the potential to increase the impact of faculty research in the area by bundling common efforts, and possibly provide a richer and more stimulating intellectual environment for scholars working in allied areas. Through this initiative, the College will also help improve public understanding, serve as a convening authority for those pursuing the subject, chart the state of the nation, tell what is known, fill in some of the gaps, elucidate what is known about best practice, act as a resource for policymakers and practitioners, and perhaps begin to assist in alleviating the problem.

Presidential Search. Following President Levine’s announcement, the Trustees initiated the process of seeking his successor. In a November, 2005, communication to the Teachers College community, the Trustees reported that a Search Committee comprised of Trustees, faculty, students, and alumni has been constituted, and the search firm of SpencerStuart has been retained to assist the College in its effort.

The institution’s commitment to the Educational Equity initiative is at the core of the search for the new president. The case statement for the presidential search articulates clearly that the president will lead Teachers College in these social and educational issues. The new
president will not only assure that the College is an essential resource for scholars, practitioners, and policymakers, with a focus on the mission of educational equity as the underlying principle of the College’s academic programs, but will also actively shape and influence public discourse, putting educational equity at the top of the national agenda. Further, the new president will be charged to promote community and diversity, and position Teachers College as an ethical institution working to promote social justice through its activities.

Self-Study Design

Nature and Scope of Self-Study

Teachers College undertook its most recent Middle States self-study during the 1996-97 academic year, with a visit in Spring, 1997. The self-study had been initially scheduled for the 1995-96 academic year; however, with the then-recent appointment of Arthur Levine as President, and the pending appointments of three senior administrative positions, the Commission graciously approved deferring the self-study to the following year.

While the Periodic Review Report (PRR) is normally provided five years after the self-study, the College’s PRR was scheduled for June, 2001, thereby reestablishing our normal review calendar.

The prior two self-study reports presented to the Commission used the Selected Topic model. In 1985-86, our selected topic of self-study was entitled “A Process Model for Designing a Continuing Education Agenda.” In 1996-97, the topic was entitled “Mission Review and Reorganization of the College.”

Having not conducted a comprehensive review of the College for many years, the Teachers College Middle States Steering Committee decided one should be conducted as part of our self-study in 2005-06. However, due to major initiatives and commitments in the area of improving the student experience at the College, it was also decided that we would like to emphasize this area as part of our self-study. Therefore, Teachers College, Columbia University will, for its 2005-06 Middle States Self-Study, conduct a comprehensive review with a special emphasis on the student experience.

Goals and Objectives

The goals for our self-study were to conduct a comprehensive review of the College based on the applicable Standards of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, having not conducted such a review in many years; and, to use the self-study to focus on ways to improve the student experience at the College, building on recent evaluative efforts at Teachers College (including our Strategic Plan and the NCATE review).

Realizing that we could focus on many aspects of the student experience, we decided to focus our inquiry to lay the foundation for initiatives that would have the potential for significant, positive impact on the student experience. Specifically:

- Provide an inventory of assessments at the College which are aimed at assessing both student learning and the student experience.
• Develop a plan for increasing financial support for students, including scholarships, professional presentations, etc., and for using that plan strategically around the College’s recruitment and retention goals.

• Develop a plan to assess and improve the academic and professional advisement of all students.

We realize the agenda is ambitious. We realize as well that we are at early stages in moving forward on each of the initiatives outlined in A Strategic Plan for Teachers College, 2004. We are also in the early stages of our institutional commitment, embedded in many of the strategic planning initiatives, to improve the quality of the student experience at the College. Our self-study design was a product of that commitment. The strategic planning process and the self-study experience to date have, we believe, been instrumental in laying the foundation for the work that will engage us as a community over the next decade.

---

A Note About Resource Materials. Throughout our self-study we reference a wide range of supporting materials and documentation. In some instances (e.g., Faculty Handbook, Teachers College Catalog, etc.) copies of those materials directly accompanied our self-study report. In a few instances, we have included materials in an appendix to a given chapter. Most supporting materials, however, will be made available in the Resource Room supporting the evaluation team’s site visit. To the extent possible, to provide for easier access and review, we will also make those materials available on-line.
Executive Summaries

The sections which follow provide a brief summary of each of the subsequent chapters of our self-study report (Chapters II through IX). Each summary also includes a snapshot of the recommendations brought forward in each chapter.

Chapter II: Institutional Context
Standards 1, 2, and 3

Chapter II addresses the first three standards related to institutional context: Mission, Goals, and Objectives; Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal; and, Institutional Resources. In addressing these standards, the chapter focuses on four questions:

- How do our mission, goals, and objectives impact decisions on resource allocation and operations of the College?
- How do our mission and its instantiation in the College’s current operations address improvement of the student experience?
- How does our resource allocation process work and what appropriate constituencies are involved in this process?
- What procedures are in place for addressing the above, both in the short and long term?

In addressing the standards and responding to these questions, the report reviews the five major goals that were defined by the strategic planning process, as well as the 21 strategic initiatives through which the College seeks to accomplish its goals. As the goals and objectives associated with strategic planning play a central role in determining the allocation of resources, this chapter also reviews the work of the Long-range Financial Planning Committee and progress toward adopting a multi-year approach to resource allocation that better aligns with institutional goals and priorities. In a related vein, the discussion also looks at the reconsideration of the College’s relationship to Columbia University and the College’s optimal size and student mix.

Central to the work of the College over the last several years has been its focus on improving the student experience, and Chapter II addresses in this context the need to provide greater scholarship support along with other steps taken towards improving the quality of life for individuals currently enrolled at the College.

As work proceeds on the implementation of strategic planning initiatives and on improving the quality of the student experience, the report notes that major decisions at the College, including the strategic planning process in both its adoption and implementation phases, have been made through a process of consensus-building across relevant constituencies at the College. Typically, these include representatives of the professional staff, senior staff, faculty, and in certain cases, the unions and students as well. The procedures in place for developing consensus on the goals and objectives of strategic planning as well as regular operations at the
College, including budget and academic issues, have been the cross-constituency committees mentioned above, as well as other standing committees at the College, including the Faculty Executive Committee, Department Chairs, and Senior Staff. In the short term, and in the long term as needed, the College has and will continue to draw upon representatives of these groups to guide decision-making about actions and resource allocations relevant to mapping out and realizing its future.

Recommendations. In its careful review of strategic planning, resource allocation, and institutional resources, Chapter II provides an essential context for subsequent sections of our self-study, including several of the recommendations offered later in this report. Implicit in this chapter’s review of the strategic planning goals and the 21 initiatives identified to accomplish those goals is a recommendation, foundational to our complete self-study, that the College sustain its commitment to and engagement in accomplishing those goals and initiatives over both the near-term and longer-term phases of the strategic plan. Further, as essential to realizing the goals and objectives outlined for the College, the College must complete its transition from incremental, annual budgeting to long-range financial planning and budgeting that assures resource allocation aligned with College goals and objectives. With respect to specific near-term initiatives, the College will need to act on the recommendations of the comprehensive modeling project and the technology advisory group. Additionally, as the strategic planning process was broadly participatory and transparent, it is important that the College continue to engage all facets of the community in the ongoing implementation work around each of the initiatives, and actively keep the community informed of progress on or modifications to those initiatives. We also recommend continued improvements to the physical and technological infrastructure of the College, particularly classroom and instructional spaces. Additional student financial aid resources are also recommended.

Chapter III: Institutional Context
Standards 4 and 5: Leadership, Governance, and Administration

With respect to Leadership and Governance, the chapter demonstrates how the College’s system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. Further, the governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development consistent with the mission of the College. With respect to Administration, the chapter describes the College’s administrative structure and services, and illustrates how they support the programs of teaching/learning, research/scholarship, and service, while also assuring quality improvement and support for the College’s organization and governance.

The sections organized in this chapter also address key questions:

- How does the leadership, governance, and administration at the College foster the implementation of our mission, goals, and objectives?

- Do our governance and administrative structures provide support for student decision-making in matters related to the College as a whole, and specifically to the student experience?
Strategic planning, considered at length in Chapter II, is described briefly as a context for and evidence of meeting the standards for Leadership and Governance and for Administration. *The Strategic Plan for Teachers College* addresses every aspect of the institution, including its programs, operations, facilities, and finances.

**Leadership and Governance.** The report details how the College, consistent with its mission, has traditionally sought and implemented governance modes that provide for the effective participation of various sectors of the College. In particular, the discussion focuses on the Trustees, the President and Officers of the College, the participation of the Faculty in governance, the revitalization of the Student Senate, and the role of other community members in College governance. The section also addresses integrative mechanisms for engaging all constituencies in issues of cross-College concern.

**Organization and Administration of the College.** This section of Chapter III provides an overview of the organization and administration of the College. The report focuses on important changes and developments subsequent to our last self-study, particularly changes and developments that support the programs of teaching/learning, research/scholarship, and service, while also assuring quality improvement and support for the College’s organization and governance.

With respect to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean, the report highlights initiatives that involved the creation of new units and/or the substantial redesign of existing offices or units in five areas that “roll-up” administratively to the Dean: the Office of Enrollment and Student Services, the Office of Teacher Education and School-based Support (OTESS), the Office of Accreditation and Assessment, the Office of Policy and Research, and the Gottesman Libraries.

With respect to the Vice President for Finance and Administration, at the time of the 1997 self-study, there were several financial and administrative challenges faced by the College. The report details the substantial accomplishments with respect to improving administrative leadership and staff performance; delivering balanced operating budgets with surpluses for 11 consecutive years, and repaying a prior, accumulated operating deficit of $4 million; developing effective, timely accounting controls and financial information; accomplishing major renovations to the physical plant; installing and supporting higher-performing modern technology systems; and, improving the general satisfaction of students, faculty, and staff regarding administrative services.

With respect to the Vice President for Development and External Affairs, since 1996, as part of a strategic effort to make the College and its achievements more visible to the nation and the educational community, the College has expanded its institutional development capacity, particularly within the areas of development and external relations. This section of the report briefly highlights accomplishments in the areas of institutional advancement, particularly with respect to the successful capital campaign and the resources raised in support of teaching and learning, research and scholarship, and service; post-campaign fundraising; strategic planning; alumni affairs; and, external affairs.
Recommendations. With respect to the organization, leadership, and administration of the College, the overarching recommendation focuses on the successful conclusion of the current search for a new president of the College. The report recognizes the prerogatives of a new president to review the current organization and administrative structures and possibly recommend adjustments or major changes. In that context, the review concurs that the organizational structures of the College, which remain largely unchanged from its 1985 reorganization, be reviewed. An interim evaluation of the 1996-97 reorganization of the academic departments surfaced concerns in a number of areas (some of which predated the reorganization initiative). This new review would assure a “best fit” with the new mission of the College, the Campaign for Educational Equity, and the other initiatives outlined in the strategic plan. A related recommendation involves the organization of the academic departments, research centers, and institutes.

Additionally, with respect to governance, the review in Chapter III recommends assuring a more consistent and formal involvement of students at the academic program and department levels and also suggests exploring alternatives for establishing an effective, broadly representative, cross-College governance body. The assessment and evaluation of new initiatives was also recommended.

Chapter IV: Institutional Context
Standard 6: Institutional Integrity

This section of our self-study focuses on demonstrating how the College, in the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, adheres to ethical standards and to its own stated policies, thereby providing support for academic and intellectual freedom.

With respect to business dealings and financial reporting, the discussion documents that the College engages in practices which embody the “spirit” of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2003, and which are applicable to and consistent with academia. The report also details practices with respect to federal and charitable donor funding. Sections of the report, focusing on research conducted by faculty and students, document compliance with the protection of human subjects and with requirements related to conflict of interest and research integrity.

Subsequent sections of Chapter IV review the policies and procedures which ensure fair and impartial practices in the hiring, evaluation, and dismissal of employees. The report details how the College ensures fairness and integrity in relation to all areas of human resource management, including hiring practices, promotion and tenure, discipline and dismissal, grievances, and specific procedures concerning union employees. Particular attention is given to demonstrating the College’s commitments to fairness and diversity. In addition to reviewing the Diversity Mission Statement, adopted in October, 2002, the report also documents, among other evidence, the work of the Office of Diversity and Community and sponsored initiatives related to community, diversity, civility, equity, and discrimination.

Lastly, sections of Chapter IV review the College’s commitments to and supports for academic and intellectual freedom, promoting educational equity outside the institution, and recognizing and protecting student rights and responsibilities.
Recommendations  Chapter IV offers the following recommendations. The first, in affirming the importance of the Campaign for Educational Equity, underscores the importance of sustaining an internal emphasis on educational equity for our students, staff, and faculty. To that end, the report recommends sustaining efforts to keep members of the College community actively engaged in the Campaign. The report also recognizes the importance of comprehensive, ongoing programs of professional development and training for staff at all levels, and recommends support for the initiatives being developed in partnership between the Offices of Community and Diversity and Human Resources. In a related vein, the report recommends reviewing all job descriptions for all positions and establishing a process that ensures that all job descriptions clearly state the College’s expectations of employees. Further, the report recommends a complete overhaul of the performance appraisal system at the College and establishing a mandatory revised performance appraisal system. In anticipation of recommendations developed in Chapter VI (Standards 8 and 9), the report also recommends systematic attention to all policies and procedures that apply to student life at the College, toward the goal of assuring both fair and equitable policies and procedures and the effective, transparent communication of these policies and procedures to all students. Lastly, the report also recommends systematic attention to all policies and procedures that apply to student life at the College toward the goal of assuring both fair and equitable policies and procedures and the effective, transparent communication of those policies and procedures to all students.

Chapter V: Institutional Context
Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

The materials and discussion presented in this chapter describe the College’s efforts to evaluate its effectiveness in achieving its mission, goals, and objectives, as formulated in the strategic plan; implementing planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal processes; using institutional resources efficiently; providing leadership and governance; providing administrative structures and services; and, demonstrating institutional integrity.

Assessment and evaluation processes and practices at the College share several defining characteristics: they are collaborative, i.e., involve a number of constituencies (faculty, students, staff, administration, trustees, and outside partners as appropriate) at all stages, from the development of evaluative studies to the review of the results; they use multiple qualitative and quantitative measures; they utilize a variety of data-gathering mechanisms and draw from a range of information sources, both internal and external; and, they yield results that are useful in institutional planning, resource allocation, and renewal, either at the level of an individual department or office, or College-wide.

The strategic plan provides a framework for evaluation processes and practices. It formulates a cohesive model of goals and specific objectives and strategies, each with corresponding measures of success. The discussion reviews how, in the process of implementing its strategic goals, the College continues to systematically collect and thoroughly analyze a wide array of quantitative and qualitative data. As illustration, the report reviews the Comprehensive Modeling project, a strategic planning initiative which involves the careful analysis of the current make-up of the College as a basis for defining and selecting alternatives that yield the optimum
size and mix of enrollments for the College, and provide a basis for establishing a plan to implement adjustments to the College’s current scale, potentially reducing its reliance on tuition income and designing and executing comprehensive strategies to fund the needs of the College.

Also reviewed is the work of the Long-range Financial Planning Committee, which has started the process of reviewing administrative functions and services for the purpose of informing and making budgetary recommendations to future annual operating budgets. This will serve as a model for expanded future reviews, including academic programs, that will work with other initiatives to ultimately result in the assessment of the entire College.

While in the process of transitioning to a long-range planning process, the College continues to follow a well-established process for developing its annual budget. This section of our report reviews annual budgeting and resource allocation processes, and the assessment and evaluation practices that are part of that annual cycle.

Chapter V also addresses the work of the Technology Priorities Planning Group, which was charged with identifying technology planning priorities, and which engaged in a number of assessment and review activities to develop its recommendations.

Human resource policies and practices, including such evaluative functions as screening potential applicants, assessing salary equity, overseeing performance appraisals for professional staff, and assessing professional development needs and activities, are reviewed. Additionally, the College’s responsibility for the performance of its faculty, which includes systematic and comprehensive evaluations conducted by both students and peers (reappointment, promotion, and tenure reviews), is also discussed.

The remaining sections of the chapter discuss the periodic review and assessment, by appropriate bodies, of the College’s policies on governance and administration. Also reviewed are the periodic assessment of the integrity evidenced in institutional policies, processes, and practices, and the manner in which these are implemented. In evaluating the effectiveness of its academic offerings, the College relies on internal and external studies, and we review several recent examples of these self-studies.

The strategic plan states that the College has to “evaluate all College programs to support continuing improvement.” It aims to establish a formal program of evaluation and renewal for all instructional programs and centers/institutes within the College to support continuing excellence in scholarship, teaching, research, and contributions to their disciplines.

Recommendations. At the core of the strategic plan is the necessity for ongoing, comprehensive evaluation of programs and services to support continuing improvement and institutional renewal. In that context, the key recommendation of this chapter supports establishing a formal program of evaluation and renewal for all instructional programs and centers and institutes within the College, to support continuing excellence in scholarship, teaching, research, and contributions to their disciplines. More specific assessment and evaluation recommendations are brought forward in subsequent chapters. The report also supports the recommendation to develop an effective communications plan, including an assessment component, to sustain engagement with the strategic plan. Concurring with the
recommendation to review and overhaul the performance appraisal system, the report recommends linking professional development programs with performance appraisal outcomes. Lastly, the report recommends initiating discussions toward the goal of developing and implementing a formal post-tenure review process for faculty.

Chapter VI: Educational Effectiveness
Standards 8 and 9: Student Admissions and Student Support Services

This section of our self-study report addresses two standards related to Educational Effectiveness: Standard 8—Student Admission, and Standard 9—Student Support Services. As these two areas of institutional activity are primarily the province of the Office of Enrollment and Student Services (OESS), we describe and evaluate the operations of OESS in some detail. Additionally, certain aspects of Standard 9 go beyond the purview of OESS alone and are also addressed in this chapter. In particular, the Office of Residential Services, the Office of Safety and Security, the Office of Student Accounts, Computing and Information Services (under the Vice President of Finance), and the Office of Community and Diversity (in the President’s Office) play important roles in student life at Teachers College. Finally, this chapter reviews the student grievance system, a set of processes in which a number of offices across the institution participate in important ways.

This report is divided into five main sections. The first section focuses on the Office of Enrollment and Student Services, which houses admissions and most of student services. The discussion reviews the College’s objectives in establishing the Office and provides preliminary evidence to document how those intentions have been realized to date.

The second section examines the admissions process, with a particular focus on the role that financial aid plays in that process. Extended reviews and analyses of Admission and Financial Aid are also provided. The evaluation of Admission and Financial Aid are developed within the context of the College’s goal to recruit and retain a highly able, diverse class.

The third section discusses student services as delivered by those offices organized within OESS: Registrar/Doctoral Studies, Student Activities and Programs, International Services, Access/Services for Individuals with Disabilities, and Career Services. The primary functions and services of each area are briefly outlined, and an evaluation of each area based on data from assessments, where available, is provided.

Following this, the fourth section examines the student service offices housed outside Enrollment and Student Services, including the Offices of Community and Diversity, Residential Services, Safety and Security, Student Accounts, and Computing and Information Services. As with the previous section treating offices within OESS, the discussion of each of these areas provides a brief overview of the primary functions and services of the office. An evaluation based on available assessment data is also provided.

This section also provides a review of the complaint and grievance resolution processes that exist at the College. College policy and practice with respect to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) is also briefly reviewed.
Recommendations. The report ends with a summary of recommendations in three broad categories. First, admissions and financial aid increase the level of need-based aid; provide additional merit-based aid; refine assessments of admissions and financial aid by student department or program; and, sustain current efforts to improve Office of Financial Aid. Second, student services offices within OESS, in the context of a comprehensive review of institutional policies related to doctoral programs of study, develop and implement a plan for the improvement of service delivery in the Office of Doctoral Studies; conduct more comprehensive assessments of several student service offices and use those assessments to implement improvements in services; and, complete an assessment of the web of resources and information throughout the College related to career development and employment opportunities, using that as a basis for collaboration, coordination, and program development through the Office of Career Services. Third, student support services housed outside of OESS conduct systematic evaluations of programs and activities sponsored by the Office of Community and Diversity; refine surveys by Residence Life and Academic Computing Services to provide for finer grain analyses (by program, by student characteristics such as gender, race-ethnicity, and national origin); sustain and complete initiatives to clarify complaint and grievance resolution processes at the College; invest resources in the renovation of the College’s residential facilities; and, conduct comprehensive assessments of several student service offices housed outside of OESS in order to implement improvements in services.

Chapter VII: Educational Effectiveness

Standard 10: Faculty

This chapter focuses on the faculty and instructional staff of the College and provides additional information to document that the College’s instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, and supported by qualified professionals. In addressing this standard, the review was framed by the following concerns:

- What are the procedures for hiring, granting tenure to, and promoting full-time regular faculty?
- How are adjunct faculty, lecturers, and instructors hired and evaluated?
- How do faculty remain engaged in the development, maintenance, and assessment of the College’s academic programs?
- How does the College encourage and recognize multiple modes of teaching, research, and service, and provide ongoing opportunities for professional development?
- What is the faculty’s role and responsibility in student academic advisement?

Chapter VII provides an overview of the size and composition of the College’s Faculty, with particular attention to the distribution of faculty by rank, tenure and non-tenure status, as well as race and ethnicity. There is an extended discussion of the permission to recruit process and the College’s commitment to improving diversity among its Faculty.

The personnel policies, practices, and procedures which are instrumental to the College’s success in continuing to recruit and retain a first-class faculty are carefully detailed. The basic
framework of the personnel policies and procedures is reviewed, with attention to the guiding assumptions, multiple points of evaluation, and criteria for evaluation.

The report describes the flexible staffing alternatives developed by the College to respond to new or changing market opportunities, program development needs, and mandates from state, regional or professional accrediting or regulatory bodies. Faculty compensation policies and practices are also presented, with particular attention to concerns regarding salary equity and salary compression.

The report briefly reviews policies and procedures for initial appointment and reappointment of adjuncts, lecturers, and instructors, as well as recent efforts to provide more effective orientation and community-building. Concerns about competitive compensation practices are also presented.

Supplementing discussions elsewhere in our self-study (Chapters II, III, and VII), this chapter briefly addresses the various ways in which faculty are actively and responsibly engaged, across their various roles, in governance as well as strategic planning, resource allocation and budgeting in both annual and long-term contexts, and program evaluation and assessment. Similarly, noting the more extensive discussion under Standard 11, a brief review of faculty professional development opportunities and support is presented here.

The last section of this chapter reviews advisement practices, noting the variability across programs and degree levels. Advising challenges that are functions of current approaches to course scheduling and planning are also noted.

Recommendations. Many of the challenges the College faces with this standard are functions of the College as a decentralized institution, with nine departments and more than 65 programs of study. Much of academic program planning proceeds at the program level, underscoring the need for improved coordination and collaboration across programs and across and within academic departments. This chapter offered several recommendations in that context, including: with respect to advisement, undertake a comprehensive audit of advisement policies and practices, including developing mechanisms to assess the actual advisement load of each member, and with those assessments as a base, develop a set of recommendations to improve student advisement; establish and support the priority of creating and publishing an accurate course schedule for the entire academic year and summer; create supports and incentives to foster cross-program and cross-department planning; incorporate modeling practices to assure competitive faculty salaries; review the compensation of adjuncts, instructors, and lectures to determine College competitiveness in the market; review all sources and forms of professional development funding at the College and develop recommendations to maximize leverage in order to increase opportunities for professional development; and, finalize and implement revisions to the Affirmative Action Handbook. Two recent changes to faculty personnel policies and practices have been approved in principle and the implementation of both policies – maternity/paternity leave for faculty, and early retirement incentive program – was supported.
Chapter VIII: Educational Effectiveness
Standards 11 and 14: Assessment of Student Learning and Educational Outcomes

As an integral part of evaluating student learning is related to evaluating the design, content, and academic rigor of educational offerings, this chapter addresses Standards 11 and 14 together. In addressing those standards, the materials and discussion presented in this chapter also focus on two related concerns: demonstrating that the procedures that are in place to ensure that the College’s course offerings meet the needs of our students, impart the College’s educational philosophy, and are consistent with the mission of the College; and, documenting how the College assesses the progress of its students, and the professional contribution of its graduates.

A brief introduction to the teaching and learning environment at Teachers College, including general academic requirements for the programs leading to master’s and doctoral degrees, and describing a variety of curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular learning opportunities available to master’s and doctoral students, is provided as a context for the discussion and review that follow.

The section on program and course approval processes describes one of the mechanisms designed to ensure quality of College educational offerings. The results of the College’s course evaluations present evidence from another College-wide mechanism of quality assurance. They illustrate how student feedback is used to improve courses, to help in the hiring of adjunct faculty, and even to reward faculty who have consistently strong evaluations. The discussion also notes how both the dissemination and usefulness of course evaluations can be improved.

A description of the College’s learning resources and supports provides a glimpse at a variety of resources, facilities, equipment, and library services that are available to our students, faculty, and staff in support of teaching, learning, and institutional effectiveness.

The discussion of the evaluation philosophy of the College illustrates the conceptual framework used to evaluate our students and describes how expectations of student learning are consistent with the mission of the College and the standards of higher education in the specific disciplines.

A detailed description of the NCATE assessment philosophy, conceptual framework, and standards serves as a specific illustration of how the general evaluation philosophy of the College has been merged with program and field specific requirements, and codified into a detailed assessment plan covering the 27 programs that prepare teachers and other professional school personnel.

The types of both College- and program-level assessments that are used at the College are then described, and the results and ways they are used are discussed. Included among these assessments are retention and time-to-degree studies, licensure exams, the student satisfaction survey, and exit/alumni surveys.

By describing the common student-level assessments conducted by academic programs, we illustrate the rigor and the variety of the academic expectations for master’s and doctoral students.
Recommendations. Based on the discussion and analysis, the subcommittee brought forward two recommendations: first, that the College build on the momentum generated by the NCATE assessment plan and broaden it to include all of the programs at the College, always keeping in mind the unique characteristics of each program; and, second, that the course evaluation form be reviewed and revised, and that the results of the evaluations be more readily available to students so that they can review them when choosing courses.

Chapter IX: Educational Effectiveness
Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

This section of our self-study focuses on programs and activities in support of our degree students that have particular content, location or mode of delivery that differ from regular course offerings. In addition, the report describes a set of certificate programs throughout the College in which degree students may take courses, but in which only non-degree students may obtain certificates. The intent of this report is to examine:

- How do these educational activities relate to the offerings in the regular academic programs of our degree students?
- How, if at all, do these related educational offerings enhance the educational experience of our degree students?
- What evidence does the College have that these offerings enhance or enrich our degree students’ experience at the College?
- What decision-making apparatus is in place at the College to ensure that these offerings address students’ needs, but do not undercut the integrity of the formal academic program?

With respect to basic skills, programs and services organized under three different units of the College are reviewed: the Gottesman Library, the Graduate Writing Center, and, Academic Computing Services.

While the programs and services are viewed as providing valuable student services, these recommendations were offered: formal assessment of student learning in workshops; proactive planning in the form of assessment of student needs; a more formal process for academic advisors to refer students who need these services; and, greater coordination between units that offer workshops and academic departments about the kinds of workshops that programs need.

At Teachers College, the Lifelong Learning Program, provided through the Center for Educational and Outreach and Innovation (CEO&I), extends and augments the students’ experience through programs offered in cooperation with the College’s academic departments. The report provides a snapshot of the audiences served by CEO&I, the relationship of CEO&I programs and offerings to academic programs, and the evaluation and assessment mechanisms CEO&I has implemented.

The review surfaces recommendations suggestions that would help strengthen program planning and development, including that each academic department establish a liaison or
committee to work with CEO&I to plan and coordinate workshop offerings across all academic programs; and, that Lifelong Learning work more closely with academic programs to devise appropriate assessment instruments for individual workshops, which can be regularly reviewed by faculty and programs to determine the effectiveness of individual workshops and of the workshop program as a whole.

With respect to branch campus and additional locations, the chapter reviews three long-standing programs: the M.A. program in TESOL in Japan (branch campus), the M.A. program in Music Education, and the Ed.D. program in Gifted Education (both of which are identified as additional locations). Each of these programs are well-established cohort-based programs that adhere to the same academic standards as programs that meet at Teachers College. The discussion offers suggestions for to improving access to instructional and student services for all off-campus programs, and, more specifically, recommends further analysis of retention patterns in the Taiwan Music program and possible responses to address the problem.

As for distance learning, the discussion briefly reviews the distance learning program, which includes both online certificate programs and individual courses that are part of degree programs at the College. An analysis of student evaluations of online courses is provided, and several recommendations are offered focusing on the future success of online offerings.

Lastly, certificate programs at the College are reviewed. While the programs are widely varied, all are relatively small, involving no more than 150 participants per year in total; all are overseen by academic programs and adhere to the course standards of those programs.

Recommendations. The recommendations focus on developing a more coordinated, efficient, and equitable use of the educational programs, resources, and activities reviewed in this chapter. Recommendations were offered in four areas: assuring that non-degree and degree students, and students attending on campus or off-site, have comparable access to Teachers College services and resources; engaging academic programs more broadly in planning for, delivering, and assessing related educational activities and services; developing a more comprehensive and systematic assessment of all related educational activities, utilizing those assessments to improve programs and services and more effectively meet student needs; and, continuing and extending initiatives to more effectively and extensively integrate online learning opportunities into academic programs of study.
Appendix I-A

Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Subcommittees

The Steering Committee for the self-study, chaired by Associate Dean Donald Martin, consisted of the following members:

- O. Roger Anderson – Professor and Chair, Dept. of Mathematics, Science and Technology
- Darlyne Bailey – Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College
- William Baldwin – Associate Dean for Academic Administration
- Margaret Crocco – Associate Professor, Social Studies and Education and Chair, Faculty Executive Committee
- Kevin Dougherty – Associate Professor, Higher Education
- Donald Martin – Associate Dean for Enrollment and Student Services
- Kim Pereira – Doctoral Student and President, Teachers College Student Senate
- Scott Schnackenberg – Director, Office of Institutional Studies
- Fred Schnur – Vice President for Finance and Administration

The Steering Committee created subcommittees to address each of the Standards for our self-study. Steering Committee members were identified to serve as chairs or co-chairs of the majority of the Standard Subcommittees, while other Teachers College community members were selected to serve as chairs or co-chairs for Standard Subcommittees addressing Standards 7, 8 and 9, and Standard 13. The names of Subcommittee Chairs appear in boldface below.

Standards 1, 2, and 3: Mission, Goals, Objectives; Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal; Institutional Resources
- Darlyne Bailey – Steering Committee member
- Fred Schnur – Steering Committee member
- Charles Basch – Professor and Chair, Department of Health and Behavioral Studies
- Joseph Brosnan – Vice President for Development and External Affairs
- Margaret Crocco – Steering Committee member
- Steve Weinberg – Director of Budget and Planning
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- William Baldwin – Steering Committee member
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- Scott Fahey – Assistant to the President, Secretary of the College
- Ena Haines – Director of Information Technology
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- Marianne Tramelli – Director, Office of Career Services
- Jackie Diaz-Solano – Associate Director of Student Accounts
- James Mitchell – Director of Residential Services and Security
- Thomas Rock – Director of Admission
- Amy Warren – Teachers College student

Standard 10: Faculty
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- Warner Burke – Professor, Psychology and Education
- Lee Knefelkamp – Professor, Psychology and Education
- Ryan Warren – Budget Administrator, Office of the Dean

Standards 11 and 14: Educational Offerings; Assessment of Student Learning
- O. Roger Anderson – Steering Committee member
- Scott Schnackenberg – Steering Committee member
- James Corter – Associate Professor, Statistics and Education
- Francy Magee – Teachers College student
- Gary Natriello – Professor, Sociology and Education; Director, Gottesman Libraries
- Aaron Pallas – Professor, Sociology and Education
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- Mark Noizumi – Teachers College Student, staff member, CEO&I
- Graeme Sullivan – Associate Professor, Art Education
Chronology of Self-Study Report

In August, 2004, President Arthur Levine and Dean Bailey named individuals to serve on the Steering Committee for our self-study report to the Middle States Association.

Associate Dean Donald Martin was appointed to serve as Chair of the Search Committee. Meetings were held once a month between August and December of 2004. Among other things, the committee discussed the preparation of the Self-Study Design, including what Model would be used for the Self-Study Report.

In October, 2004, Teachers College hosted Middle States representative Dr. Robin Dasher-Alston, who provided invaluable input on the final preparation of the Self-Study Design. Dr. Dasher-Alston left Middle States in early 2005, and following her departure, we established and have continued to maintain contact with Dr. Michael Kiphart at the Commission.

In November, 2004, the Steering Committee appointed subcommittees to prepare reports on the Standards we would be addressing in the Self-Study (see list above).

In January, 2005, the Steering Committee met with the subcommittees to review Self-Study Design and provide information on the completion of the Standard reports. Here is a brief chronology of the process of completing the subcommittee reports:

March, 2005  
- 11\textsuperscript{th} - Steering Committee received all subcommittee outlines for reports  
- 25\textsuperscript{th} - Steering Committee responded to all subcommittees on their outlines

April, 2005  
- 29\textsuperscript{th} - Steering Committee received report drafts from subcommittees for Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, and 13

May, 2005  
- 20\textsuperscript{th} - Steering Committee received report drafts from subcommittees for Standards 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 14

June, 2005  
- Steering Committee reviewed all subcommittee drafts  
- Steering Committee sent recommendations to subcommittee chairs

August, 2005  
- Final subcommittee reports submitted

In September, 2005, the Steering Committee began assembling Teachers College’s Self-Study Report, soliciting help from other members of the community to read each report and provide feedback. The Committee also asked Ms. Sasha Gribovskaya, who had just started as Director of the Office of Accreditation and Assessment, to review all of the reports to make sure they were coming together in a unified way. The College also learned at this time that our Middle States
evaluation team chair would be Sister Paula Buley, Senior Vice President for Administration at Seton Hall University. On Monday, November 14, 2005, the College hosted Sister Buley for the Chair’s Preliminary Visit.

In December, 2005, we received most of the names of the other evaluation team members, and began making arrangements for the evaluation team visit, which is scheduled for Sunday, March 5, 2006, through Wednesday, March 8, 2006. A final list of evaluation team members was given to Teachers College in January, 2006.

The final Self-Study Report was mailed to both Middle States and the evaluation team in mid-February, 2006.
CHAPTER II: INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT
STANDARDS 1, 2, AND 3

Introduction

In this section of our self-study report, we address three of the standards comprising Institutional Context:

Standard 1: Mission, Goals, and Objectives
Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal
Standard 3: Institutional Resources

In the design of our self-study, the following charges were developed to focus inquiry around these standards at Teachers College:

- How do our mission, goals, and objectives impact decisions on resource allocation and operations of the College?
- How do our mission and its instantiation in the College’s current operations address improvement of the student experience?
- How does our resource allocation process work and what appropriate constituencies are involved in this process?
- What procedures are in place for addressing the above, both in the short and long term?

In the sections which follow, we draw heavily on the Strategic Plan adopted at Teachers College in the Spring of 2004, which is now in its “Implementation Phase.” This plan includes a series of milestones which serve as indicators of progress achieved towards reaching the goals identified in the first phase of defining and articulating a new mission for the College. This plan also provides for ongoing assessment of progress made in implementing the new mission for the College and its commitment to, among other things, improving the student experience at Teachers College.

We start with a brief discussion of the historical origins and evolution of the mission of Teachers College, proceed to a consideration of the role of the strategic plan in shaping the future direction of Teachers College, look next at the allocation of institutional resources, and conclude with a review of the successes and challenges the College faces in addressing strategic planning goals.

Mission of the College

Brief History of Teachers College

Teachers College, Columbia University is an independent graduate and professional school of education, psychology, and health. It is located in the Morningside Heights area of
Manhattan. The College has been affiliated with Columbia University since 1898, but remains a separate corporation with its own endowment and its own Board of Trustees that is responsible for the general oversight of its affairs and for its financial support. As the oldest and largest school of education in the nation in number of students and faculty, Teachers College consistently ranks as one of the top three institutions in national surveys of graduate teacher education.

Teachers College was founded in 1887 by philanthropist Grace Hoadley Dodge and philosopher Nicholas Murray Butler to provide a new kind of schooling for the teachers of the poor children of New York—one that combined a humanitarian concern in helping others with a scientific approach to human development. Over its long history, Teachers College has attracted such prominent educators and scholars such as John Dewey, William Kilpatrick, Edward Lee Thorndike, Lawrence Cremin, Maxine Greene, and many others. All of them have shared the same belief in the power of education to make the world more just and humane.

The College’s long-standing commitment to the issues of social justice and equality is reflected in its achievements in improving education for disadvantaged populations. During the summers from the 1920s through the 1950s, before the Brown v. Board of Education decision, the College educated thousands of southern black teachers and principals who were unable to attend universities in their own states. Through millions of dollars in scholarship funding, the College recruited and prepared thousands of minorities as outstanding teachers, administrators, and role models.

In more recent years, the College has been drawn to the difficult problems of urban education. Resolved in its original mission to provide a new kind of education for those left most in need by society or circumstance, the College currently carries out collaborative research with urban and suburban school systems that strengthens teaching in such fundamental areas as reading, writing, science, mathematics, and the arts. It develops and evaluates programs for students with special needs. It prepares leaders to develop and administer psychological and health care programs in schools, hospitals, and community agencies. It also advances technology for the classroom by developing new teaching software and by keeping teachers abreast of new developments in this area.

While reaching across the nation and the world, Teachers College has always maintained a special interest in improving teacher and student achievement in New York City. The College is now working with over 400 public schools in the City (and over 1,200 throughout the United States) through various outreach and professional development programs.

Today, Teachers College offers more than 65 different academic programs for novice and experienced practitioners. The academic programs are organized into nine academic departments, augmented by centers, institutes, and projects, as follows:

- Arts and Humanities
- Biobehavioral Sciences
- Counseling and Clinical Psychology
- Curriculum and Teaching
- Health and Behavioral Studies
As a graduate professional school, Teachers College offers programs that lead to the degrees of Master of Arts, Master of Science, Master of Education, Doctor of Education, Doctor of Education in College Teaching, and Doctor of Philosophy. The College’s Faculty in 2005-06 is comprised of 154 full-time professorial faculty (105 tenured and 49 pre-tenure and non-tenure track), of which 21% are “minority” and 58% are female. In the Fall of 2005, the student body was comprised of 5,070 graduate students. Of that total, 3,043 (60%) were enrolled in Master’s programs; 1,715 (34%) were enrolled in doctoral programs; and 312 were non-degree students. Approximately 69% (3,503) of students were enrolled part-time. About 37% of all U.S. citizens enrolled were ethnic minority students. International students from 80 different countries made up about 13% of the student body. The median age of all students was 30.

Recent Adoption of New Mission

When Teachers College embarked upon the development of a new strategic plan in 2002, it articulated its mission as follows:

Teachers College reaffirms its commitments to enhance human welfare by preparing leaders for those professions seeking to optimize human potential, by inquiring systematically into the process and context of human development in its many forms, and by collaborating with practitioners and policymakers to envision and create a more just and compassionate world.

Upon completion of the first phase of the strategic planning process in 2004, the College adopted an institutional focus on educational equity. This new focus brought with it the need for a redefined mission statement that aligned with the institutional emphasis on educational equity. As of 2005, the mission statement of Teachers College is:

Teachers College is dedicated to promoting equity and excellence in education and overcoming the gap in educational access and achievement between the most and least advantaged groups in society. Through programs of teaching, research, and service, the College draws upon the expertise of a diverse community of faculty in education, psychology, and health, as well as students and staff from across the country and around the world.

Role of the Strategic Plan in Shaping the Future Direction of Teachers College

---

1 While there are no degree programs that lead explicitly to the award of the Master of Philosophy degree, the M. Phil. is awarded en passant by the University to students who have completed all requirements for the Ph.D., with the exception of the dissertation.

2 A full copy of A Strategic Plan for Teachers College, 2004, along with supporting materials referenced in various sections of our self study, was included in the materials forwarded to the evaluation team. A copy will also be available in the Resource Room during the site visit.
The development of a strategic plan was requested by the Board of Trustees with the goal of creating a course of action to guide the College over the next 5 to 10 years. The principal goal was to identify and adopt a primary institutional focus for the next decade and to align the College in support of that focus. As with many strategic plans, the impetus flowed from the desire to coordinate activities within the institution, ensure that the future is taken into account, and present a rational, formalized decision-making process. The following sections provide a brief overview of the goals and objectives that were defined during the strategic planning process, and the timelines that were developed for realizing those goals and objectives, including a brief update on each of the first-phase initiatives.

Goals and Objectives of College

The Strategic Planning Committee was made up of representatives from all stakeholders in the College: trustees, senior staff, faculty, students, alumni, and professional and union staff. The Committee arrived at five major goals, representing the core intent of the institution and defining its direction over the foreseeable future. These goals were shared with the entire Teachers College community. The decision to adopt these goals represented the consensus of all parties.

1. Increase the impact of Teachers College on the fields that it serves by:
   a) Increasing its influence and authority in policy formulation;
   b) Housing and educating leaders in the fields;
   c) Becoming more proactive with practitioners and policymakers; and
   d) Meeting the needs of a dynamic environment.

2. Reestablish Teachers College as the premier school of education in fact and reputation by:
   a) Earning credibility through highly visible success in New York City;
   b) Learning to speak with an institutional voice;
   c) Focusing on issues that can be identified with the entire institution; and
   d) Producing the highest quality scholarship and practitioners.

3. Assure the long-term financial viability of the College by:
   a) Addressing issues of scale and complexity decisively;
   b) Improving the economic model;
   c) Reducing the College’s historic dependency on tuition revenues;
   d) Creating a more beneficial relationship with Columbia University; and
   e) Capitalizing on recent fund-raising success.

4. Improve all aspects of the student experience by:
   a) Increasing financial support for students;
   b) Improving core student services as they impact on the student experience;
   c) Developing effective, sensitive institutional systems; and
   d) Providing better facilities and equipment.

5. Make the College operate more effectively by:
a) Organizing to support goals;
b) Evaluating all programs and making necessary changes;
c) Adjusting governance practices;
d) Continuing to develop a more diverse community with a shared mission;
e) Investing in the development of the professional capabilities of all members of the community; and
f) Improving decision-making.

Strategic Planning Timelines

The strategic plan for Teachers College consists of a set of 21 strategic initiatives. Implementation work began in March 2004 and will continue over the next 9 years. The plan is divided into two time periods; both time periods contain several themes around which a series of specific initiatives has been developed. These themes express the nature of the challenges and opportunities that the specific initiatives of the plan address.

Below, the first phase of the plan is presented in chronological order. Although each initiative is presented as occurring within a specific phase, many of the activities will, in fact, span both phases. Some will become permanent aspects of Teachers College’s operations. Therefore, the specific initiatives are listed in the phase in which their impact is most felt, regardless of whether they actually begin or end within that phase.

The strategic plan’s progress is monitored through the Strategic Plan Implementation Committee, consisting of the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean, three Board co-chairs, two Faculty members, and the Vice-President for Development and External Affairs. Regular reports are made to the Faculty about the progress of efforts spearheaded by this group to keep the College on track.

The strategic planning process does not duplicate or parallel decision-making processes or lines of authority which exist at the College; rather, it is integrated within them. As recommendations are made by the Strategic Planning Implementation Committee, they will be approved by the Trustees and Senior Staff, and then implemented under the direction of the respective Senior Staff member whose area is affected. Further discussion on leadership, administration, and governance at the College is found in Chapter III: Standards 4 and 5.

The following sections provide a brief overview of the four themes and related initiatives which shape the strategic planning implementation work during Phase 1 (March 2004 through December 2005). A brief update on the initiatives under each theme is provided in italics.

The first Phase 1 Strategic Planning theme, 1.1 Focus the College’s efforts on achieving educational equity in the U.S. and abroad, comprises the following initiatives:

---

3Reflecting practice at the College, for the remainder of our self-study, the title “Dean” will be used as a shorthand for the full title “Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean.”

4The numbering of initiatives, e.g., 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, etc., follows the system used in A Strategic Plan for Teachers College, 2004.
1.1.1 Create an internal leadership team to direct the implementation of the strategic plan: Designate a team of faculty, staff, trustees, and external experts to direct the implementation of the plan and monitor its progress. This 8-member team comprised of faculty, senior staff, Trustees, and consultant has been created and continues to meet on a monthly basis.

1.1.2 Identify, fund, and execute initiatives related to educational equity in all Teachers College disciplines: Establish a Think Tank to coordinate research, publications, and outreach activities, and support Teachers College faculty and curriculum so that they relate directly to the new institutional focus to the greatest extent that is practical. A comprehensive report detailing the process by which think tanks organize and operate was completed in September, 2004. Visits to several think tanks were also conducted in Fall, 2004. The director for the Campaign for Educational Equity, Michael Rebell, was hired in June, 2005, and is working on the proper configuration of new initiatives in this area. A preliminary report, proposing a multi-year program promoting comprehensive educational equity, has been developed. The report outlines specific agenda with respect to research, policy and advocacy, communications and dissemination, demonstration projects and local community outreach, and engagement within the Teachers College community.

1.1.3 Communicate Teachers College’s dedication to addressing educational equity and the impacts of all initiatives that result from those efforts: Elevate Teachers College to a new level of public awareness through consistent presence in all relevant media. This process is ongoing.

1.1.4 Orient the funds development operations toward support of the Phase 1 themes: Create a comprehensive approach to funding the initiatives of the strategic plan and ongoing needs. Initial fundraising progress has been substantial. As of February, 2006, approximately $4 million has been raised to support Phase 1 themes.

The second Phase 1 Strategic Planning theme, 1.2 Lead the field in setting priorities for research, practice, policy development, funding, and preparing leaders, is defined by the following initiatives:

1.2.1 Establish a formal policy Think Tank: Using internal and external expertise, create a Think Tank that will support the highest quality debate and stimulate action on critical questions of education practice, policy, and leadership. Following activities in 1.1.2, it was determined that “Think Tank” was too static a term and unit for the dynamic, highly interactive nature of our envisioned work. Therefore, the concept

---

5 Prior to his appointment as Director of the Campaign for Educational Equity, Michael A. Rebell served as Executive Director and Co-Counsel of the Campaign for Fiscal Equity (CFE). CFE has won a series of verdicts in New York state courts, culminating with the decision in November, 2004, by a panel of special judicial masters recommending that New York City receive an additional $5.6 billion in school operating funds and $9.2 billion in school facilities funds from New York State.

6 A copy of the report, “Promoting Comprehensive Educational Equity – A Proposed Multi-Year Program,” will be available in the Resource Room during the site visit.
of the Campaign for Educational Equity was created. Michael Rebell was named head of the Campaign for Educational Equity and a specific mission was crafted for the Campaign:

The Campaign for Educational Equity is the public voice, research, and action arm of Teachers College, dedicated to promoting equity through improved policy and practice.

1.2.2 Create new dissemination vehicles for research findings from all Teachers College disciplines: Utilize traditional and new media to distribute the results of the Teachers College Think Tank and faculty initiatives to the field rapidly and broadly. Following visits to communication directors of established think tanks, Teachers College’s Executive Director of External Affairs created a communications plan to address dissemination of research findings.

1.2.3 Develop high-profile demonstration programs that produce documented results: Demonstrate the quality and significance of Teachers College’s work through documented demonstration programs that successfully address important problems. The Strategic Planning Implementation Committee is addressing this issue in its monthly meetings.

1.2.4 Convene major symposia on issues of primary significance: Become a major convener of scholars, practitioners, and policymakers to address the most important issues in every discipline at Teachers College. An Advisory Committee comprised of Teachers College Faculty has been formed for selecting the key presenters and discussants and providing guidance on the format of the annual conference. A two-day symposium was held in October, 2005.7

The third Phase 1 Strategic Planning theme, 1.3 Invest in improved institutional operations and an enhanced, more diverse College community, is defined by the following initiatives:

1.3.1 Make key improvements in information systems: Make major improvements to the information systems that most affect the success of students, faculty, and staff. Within the broad foci that were outlined previously, the Technology Assessment Group (TAG) has provided a set of near-term (3-year) initiatives that are being reviewed by the Strategic Planning Implementation Committee8.

1.3.2 Enhance funding for all types of student financial support: Develop means of supporting students financially that will improve their educational experience and enhance Teachers College’s competitive position to attract the very best students.

---

7 Additional materials related to the symposium will be available in the Resource Room during the site visit.
8 A copy of the Technology Advisory Group’s recommendations will be available in the Resource Room during the site visit.
Financial aid issues will be examined by the strategic plan’s Comprehensive Modeling Committee.\(^9\)

1.3.3 Establish programs to foster the ongoing development of all employees: Make meaningful, consistent investments in the skills and capabilities of everyone employed at the College. The new Director of Human Resources has been charged with the responsibility to move this initiative forward.

1.3.4 Continue systematic improvements to the physical plant and equipment: Invest in the upgrade and renewal of the working and teaching environment at the College. The College’s Space Committee is addressing this issue. An expanded and redefined scope of work was articulated, a space management firm was retained, and a preliminary report, including both new physical drawings of the campus and an analysis of space utilization, is due in Spring of 2006.

The fourth Phase 1 Strategic Planning theme, 1.4 Evaluate major options for the future size of the College and its relationship with Columbia University, is defined by the following initiatives:

1.4.1 Create a Task Force to analyze a full range of possible relationships with Columbia University: Based on the improved focus of the College, systematically evaluate the range of possible relationships with Columbia University in terms that are technically rigorous, politically realistic, and financially beneficial. The Board of Trustees Co-Chairs took this on as their responsibility. A study conducted by McKinsey Associates\(^10\) was completed in the Fall of 2005.

1.4.2 Evaluate the long-term economic effects of realistic options for the scale of the College: Based on all of the initiatives of the strategic plan, continue financial and organizational modeling studies to evaluate a full range of options for the overall scale of the College. The Comprehensive Modeling Committee has been established to address this issue, and work is well underway.

Allocation of Institutional Resources

Notwithstanding the College’s accomplishments and strong financial position, it must continue to adapt to challenges such as:

- Maintaining and enhancing academic standards
- Reducing dependency on tuition revenue
- Increasing student financial aid
- Continuing to invest in facilities renovation

\(^9\)Additional materials related to the Comprehensive Modeling project will be available in the Resource Room during the site visit.

\(^10\)A copy of the report is included with the supporting materials appended to A Strategic Plan for Teachers College, 2004.
• Investing in technology
• Addressing space concerns
• Improving services
• Investing in professional development and training
• Increasing budget flexibility

Meeting these challenges requires that the College focus its attention on prioritizing its needs, with the goal of allocating scarce resources in the most effective way. The College must also continue to adapt to changes in the external environment such as changing demand for College programs, local and national economies, competition from higher education and private sectors, and the continuing technological revolution.

Shifting from an Annual to a Long-range Financial Planning Process

The College’s reliance on tuition-dominated revenue growth is likely to continue in the foreseeable future. This incremental revenue growth has been effective in sustaining the incremental growth of the College’s programs and services, especially during stable or higher enrollment. However, reliance on tuition revenue during prospective periods of erratic or diminished enrollment will severely constrain the College’s ability to respond to the challenges that lie ahead. Reliance on tuition revenue also masks the inefficiencies that exist in the College’s $112 million budget. The incremental growth of revenues and expenditures has created a pattern of expenditures that is largely determined by continuing historical commitments to administrative support and academic programs. These historical commitments are not necessarily responsive to the evolution of the College and the demands of a changing external environment. Identifying inefficiencies and creating opportunities for the reallocation of funds within the base budget will serve to better insulate the College from the ebb and flow of enrollment. Even more important, it will reorient the College focus to changing priorities rather than current resources. It is also an effective method of generating priority-relevant funding sources that complement marginal incremental tuition revenue growth.

Constituencies Involved in the Process of Resource Allocation

The College has instituted two important process and organizational initiatives to strengthen its ability to respond to the challenges cited above. The first initiative, the President’s Budget Committee, has played a major role in the allocation of operating budget resources. Initiated two years ago, the Committee consists of eight members of the Faculty representing Department Chairs, the Faculty Sub-Committee on Finance, Facilities and Support Services, and the Faculty Executive Committee as well as the six members of the Senior Staff. The College has a process in place that provides the Committee with the following information to assist in its budgetary deliberations:

• A budgetary framework that includes various scenarios of revenue and expenses for the prospective budget year;
• Financial and budgetary data, including multi-year trends; and
• Assessments of both existing academic programs and administrative activities as well as proposals for new initiatives or increased funding for existing programs.

The Committee reviews these data and plays an important advisory role in developing the annual operating budget and allocating resources. The diversity of the Committee helps to ensure that important academic and administrative issues receive consideration in a timely manner. It also improves the likelihood that the College is making resource allocation decisions that support evolving priorities tied to the mission, goals, and objectives of the College.

The second initiative that will enhance the budget allocation process is the establishment of the Long-range Financial Planning Committee. This Committee is co-chaired by the Dean and the Vice President for Finance and Administration. It was created to guide the College in using institutional resources to achieve long-term institutional priorities, which has not been possible with annual incremental budgets. The Committee has started the process of reviewing administrative functions and services for the purpose of informing and making budgetary recommendations for future annual operating budgets. This will be a model for expanded future reviews including academic programs, that will ultimately result in the comprehensive assessment of the entire College. This Committee will undertake the necessary fiscal planning to help the College meet the goals of its strategic plan within the context of future operating budgets.

The work of these committees to date has resulted in a more fluid, rational, and transparent budgetary process, which in turn has resulted in a more strategic allocation of scarce resources.

How These Processes Align with Overall Goals and Objectives

Teachers College has made a financial transition from an institution laden with annual deficits posing a threat to its future viability, to a position of financial stability and strength that has, in part, preserved its ranking as one of the preeminent leaders in education. The College has achieved surpluses in each of the past 11 years. Along with eradicating its accumulated operating deficit, the College developed a Capital Improvement Program to address the physical needs of the College.

Review of Successes and Challenges in Addressing Goals

In September, 2001, the College developed a preliminary Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for the purpose of developing a comprehensive needs inventory that included preliminary scopes of work and estimated budgets prioritized in four phases over a 5-year period. The CIP identified 32 projects with a total estimated cost of $43 million. In addition to these projects were the renovation of the Russell Library (the Gottesman Libraries) and plans for the construction of a new campus conference center. The CIP was the basis for the issuance of $42.1 million of tax-exempt bonds in August, 2002 (Series 2002 bonds). These funds were allocated to projects contained in the high-priority phases of the CIP.

The College’s financial strength and encouraging outlook were confirmed by Moody’s Investor Service in their June, 2002, and July, 2003, credit rating reports in advance of the
College’s two successful bond sales. Moody’s upgraded the College’s credit rating from A3 to A1, reflecting a two-grade improvement in their ranking of credit-worthiness. They cited the following conditions in support of their credit rating:

- A strong market position underpinned by the College’s prestigious reputation;
- Ample balance sheet resources relative to debt;
- A consistent trend of positive operating results reflecting sound financial management practices;
- Impressive student demand indicators and stable enrollment; and
- A successful fundraising campaign.

Much has been accomplished during this period of financial growth and stability:

- The College has been able to increase the number of full-time faculty positions from 131 to 154 during the period 1999-2005.
- Budget support of academic program coordinators was initiated.
- Highly skilled administrators were also recruited and retained to effectively manage the College’s academic and administrative operations.
- New offices have been created, in some instances through mergers and restructuring (e.g., Office of Policy and Research, Accreditation and Assessment, Teacher Education and School-Based Support, and Enrollment and Student Services).
- A diversity and community initiative was launched and has become part of the College’s culture.
- Financial aid has increased.
- There has been a dramatic renewal of the campus infrastructure, including the construction of a 252-unit student residence hall, the replacement of roofs and windows of academic buildings, the construction of a new central boiler and chiller plant, the capital renewal of public space and meeting rooms, the modernization of the library, the upgrade of classrooms and offices, and significant investment in technology infrastructure and support.

This progress was accomplished during a period of tuition increases in the range of 4%-6% annually, at rates competitive with institutions within and outside the College’s geographic area. A major challenge facing the College in the coming years will be to address the institutional goals and objectives while reducing its dependence on tuition-generated revenue.

Focused Review of Successes and Challenges in Addressing Student Experience

Capital Improvement Plan. To further improve the student experience, to make Teachers College a more inviting place for its students, faculty, and staff, and to provide facilities that are more conducive to teaching and learning, the College embarked on a long-range Capital
Improvement Program\textsuperscript{11} in 1996. The academic campus of Teachers College contains six buildings constructed between 1892 and 1923; Thorndike Hall, the seventh and most recent addition, was built in the 1970s. Much of the infrastructure and mechanical systems had far exceeded their useful service lives and had endured over 20 years of deferred maintenance. The College was faced with many challenges to reverse this trend, not the least of which was the $100 million preliminary cost estimate for the renewal of the physical plant. Knowing that the cost of bringing the entire campus infrastructure to a state of good repair would exceed available or potential sources of funding, the College initiated a capital needs assessment based upon prudent planning and thorough engineering analyses. This process included a careful prioritization of projects to help ensure that funding would be allocated strategically, efficiently, and at the appropriate levels.

Technology Planning. One of the strategic planning themes called for investing in improved institutional operations and an enhanced, more diverse community. This was operationalized in several ways, including as a priority making major improvements to the information systems that most affect the success of students, faculty, and staff.

To this end, a Technology Planning and Priorities Group was convened in summer of 2004 comprising directors of administrative offices, faculty and students. The group reviewed studies input gathered over several years and by summer of 2005 articulated a goal of moving routine administrative processes online by replacing paper forms with workflow-enabled web transactions accessed through a user friendly portal. Such processing is secure, transparent and auditable, while also more convenient and efficient. Faculty, students, and staff will be served by a common portal, customized to each user based on role(s), with transactions automatically routed for appropriate approvals. Actions such as personnel appointments, staff vacation and sick leave reports, purchase requisitions, course approvals, and work-study jobs will be more easily initiated by users. Document imaging will enable offices beginning with the Registrar, Admissions and Financial Aid to access and route material quickly, allowing simultaneous access from multiple offices.

The vision also includes a content management system that will enable outside guests as well as faculty, staff and students, alumni and job and admissions applicants to find information on our website. Integrated access to information from diverse sources will be based on each user’s privileges, while the creation and updating of the information will be decentralized yet subject to appropriate approvals. Pro-active communication to relevant groups of people about things ranging from special events, to degree requirements, new courses, and field work or professional opportunities will be facilitated by the integrated portal environment.

The three-year plan also includes installing display technology in approximately 14 additional classrooms. This would significantly improve support to classes in those rooms as well as in the remaining rooms still dependent on mobile carts for presentation equipment.

As of this writing (February, 2006) this vision and goal were presented to the Strategic Plan Implementation Team, and a full Faculty Meeting, Senior Staff, and Management Network. In addition to developing the vision and goals, a three-year plan for software, hardware and

\textsuperscript{11}Materials related to the Capital Improvement Program will be available in the Resource Room.
consulting services was formulated. Preparations have begun to secure tax-exempt financing for the hardware and software license components as part of our regular cycle of short-term loans to level the costs of technology upgrades over about four budget years.

**Looking Ahead to the Next Ten Years of Meeting Goals and Objectives**

As noted earlier, the Strategic Plan is divided into two time periods. Earlier sections of this chapter focused on activities, accomplishments, and work-in-process related to Phase 1. In this section, we extend the timeline and look ahead over the next 10 years. As a framework for that discussion, we restate the strategic planning goals and, under each, the initiatives to accomplish that goal.

The first goal articulated in the Strategic Planning process is to **increase the impact of Teachers College on the fields that it serves**. The College would accomplish this goal by:

- Increasing its influence and authority in policy formulation;
- Housing and educating leaders in the fields;
- Becoming more proactive with practitioners and policymakers; and
- Meeting the needs of a dynamic environment.

The most consistent way in which Teachers College influences the fields that it serves is by preparing practitioners in more than 65 different academic programs. The College offers degree programs for novice and experienced practitioners, and hosts a variety of non-credit workshops and seminars throughout the year for in-service practitioners.

Teachers College also influences the fields it serves through research and outreach in the realms of practice and policy. The College’s portfolio of research and outreach activities is not as well-organized or coordinated as its academic programs. Some activities are undertaken by individual faculty working largely in isolation. Other activities develop under the auspices of the College’s research centers and institutes, including the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, recently affiliated with the Campaign for Educational Equity; the Institute on Education and the Economy; the National Center for Children and Families; the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching; the Teachers College Reading and Writing Project; the Center for Health Promotion; and the Center for Opportunities and Outcomes, to name but a few.

Recent efforts have centered on how to organize the centers and institutes more effectively, and to enumerate the array of their activities in a way that would identify overlap as well as gaps in coverage. Moreover, the centers and institutes have begun conversations to explore their often ambiguous relations with the academic programs of the College.

Increased communication and coordination among centers and institutes greatly expand the potential impact of the College on the world of policy and practice. This two-pronged goal is supported by two of the College’s new offices: the Office of Policy and Research and the Office of Teacher Education and School-Based Support.
The second goal articulated by the Strategic Planning process is to **re-establish Teachers College as the premier school of education in fact and reputation**. The College would accomplish this goal by:

- Earning credibility through highly visible success in New York City;
- Learning to speak with an institutional voice;
- Focusing on issues that can be identified with the entire institution; and
- Producing the highest quality scholarship and practitioners.

In accomplishing this goal, the College faces several challenges in its external environments. The world of education schools has changed swiftly and profoundly, particularly with respect to demographics and economics. During the past three decades, the color, location, age, and national origin of the country’s population have shifted. Coupled with massive teacher retirements, these factors have produced concentrations of failing students and schools in the inner cities and stimulated dramatic growth of school systems in the Sunbelt states. At the same time, the change from an industrial to an information economy has raised the importance of education. This has resulted in increased levels of education minimally necessary to get a job, and in additional skills and knowledge required of students to earn a diploma and of teachers to qualify for a license. Moreover, it has altered the focus of education from emphasizing teaching to stressing student achievement, outcomes, and assessment. Education schools have been expected to change their work to fit these realities.

Additionally, after 20 years of a continuing school reform movement, education schools in America are facing a rising tide of criticism from the government, the philanthropic community, the superintendents of large urban school systems, and even the universities that house them. The charges, in short, are that their quality is too low and their activities too disconnected from practice and policy. The charges apply more to certain specific education schools than to others, and while some of the criticisms are fair, others are not.

Simultaneously, the government is diminishing the role of education schools as the “gatekeepers” of the education professions. In this more critical environment, the federal government has redefined a “highly-qualified teacher” as someone who has not necessarily taken even a single class in education. It has also legislated standards for what constitutes appropriate education research—a task normally left to the academy.

In like manner, 45 states have adopted alternative routes to entering the teaching profession. These reduce or bypass entirely the time normally spent in education schools preparing for the job. At the same time, most states have raised the requirements for students entering the teaching field via traditional education schools. Similar actions are being taken by a smaller number of states for positions in educational administration.

These changes have encouraged a mushrooming number of competitors to challenge education schools for their franchise. New competitors come from within higher education in the form of new for-profit universities like the University of Phoenix, which is engaged in preparing both administrators and teachers. Competition also arises from the expansion of sectors of higher education that previously had not produced education professionals, such as
community colleges. In New Mexico, for example, the community college system has become a primary educator of teachers, eclipsing most of the four-year colleges. There is also an array of new not-for-profits such as Teach for America, which places college graduates without education coursework in understaffed classrooms. Similarly, the Knowledge Is Power Program (KIPP) educates principals via an apprenticeship program. Both initiatives have captured much media coverage and the imagination of the public interested in education.

In addition, there are growing instances where the employers of graduates of schools of education have “gone into business” for themselves: major urban school districts such as New York City and Boston have decided to create their own administration leadership and teacher education programs rather than continuing to rely upon the universities, because these districts believe they can do a better job themselves.

The private sector has also rushed into education in an unprecedented way because it sees a growth industry and profit potentials, and recognizes overall dissatisfaction with education schools. Publishers, media giants, hardware makers, software creators, and content companies of all types have entered the marketplace.

This environment of profound change, rising criticism, deregulation, and growing competition creates a special challenge in accomplishing the goal of re-establishing Teachers College as the premier school of education in fact and reputation. All education schools are being lumped together by the public, by the government, and by commercial interests. Strong education schools are no longer distinguished from weak schools. Even Teachers College, which from its earliest years earned its reputation as a leader among education schools by attracting the world’s best minds to its Faculty, pioneering the creation of new fields, and setting a national and global course for education, is increasingly at risk to being viewed as just “one of the pack.”

The third goal articulated by the Strategic Planning process is to assure the long-term financial viability of the College. The College would accomplish this goal by:

- Addressing issues of scale and complexity decisively;
- Improving the economic model;
- Reducing the College’s historic dependency on tuition revenues;
- Creating a more beneficial relationship with Columbia University; and
- Capitalizing on recent fundraising success.

Teachers College’s overall operating revenues (including unrestricted and restricted revenue as per its audited financial statements) have grown over the past 10 years (1996-2005), from $93.8 million to $148.3 million. In 2005, the College’s principal sources of unrestricted operating revenues were student tuition and fees, representing 48% of all operating revenues and grants and contracts for research and training programs, representing 25% of all operating revenues. Investment return, auxiliary activities, government appropriations, and other sources comprised the remaining 27% of operating revenues.
Tuition revenues depend on three factors:

- The tuition rate per point\(^{12}\) per year, which has increased from $550 per point in 1995-96 academic year to $935 per point in academic year 2005-06, an average annual increase in the per-point tuition rate of 5.5%;

- The total number of points taken by students, which has increased from 68,907 points in academic year 1995-96 to 82,903 in academic year 2004-05, an annual growth rate of 1.7%; and,

- The number of students registered, which has grown from 4,624 students registered in Fall, 1996, to 5,070 registered in Fall, 2005, representing an annual growth rate of 1.1%.

Table 2.1: College Revenue, 1996-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2005</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 1996</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Tuition</td>
<td>78,466,179</td>
<td>49,516,217</td>
<td>28,949,962</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Appropriation</td>
<td>732,632</td>
<td>1,081,094</td>
<td>(348,462)</td>
<td>-47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Contracts</td>
<td>34,786,335</td>
<td>19,071,708</td>
<td>15,714,627</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>2,648,863</td>
<td>2,497,340</td>
<td>151,523</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Return</td>
<td>9,164,817</td>
<td>6,534,271</td>
<td>2,630,546</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of auxiliary operations</td>
<td>18,076,918</td>
<td>11,928,046</td>
<td>6,148,872</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td>3,155,769</td>
<td>3,119,161</td>
<td>36,608</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets released from restrictions</td>
<td>2,755,223</td>
<td>21,025</td>
<td>2,734,198</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

149,786,736 93,768,862 56,017,874 28.0%

These three factors produced a total annual growth rate in tuition revenue of 3.9%, which led Teachers College to become more dependent on tuition for unrestricted operations over this period. Moody’s Investor Services, which rates the debt securities of Teachers College, noted the College’s dependency on tuition, but added that “with net tuition steadily rising,” there “does not seem to be any threat to this revenue stream.” Nevertheless, a reduction in any of these factors that make up tuition income would have an immediate adverse impact on Teachers College’s operating position.

The College’s second largest source of revenue is derived from grants and contracts. Although this activity has grown by 35% over the last eight years, it has had no effect on the

\(^{12}\)Teachers College uses the term “point” as equivalent to “credit hour.”
Another major source of Teachers College’s operating revenues is income from the endowment, which rose from $6.2 million in 1996 to $8.5 million in 2005. This increase was accomplished because the endowment itself grew from $92.9 million in 1996 to $168 million for the year ending August 31, 2005. The College’s Trustees have established a policy designed to preserve the value of these investments in real terms (after inflation) and provide a predictable flow of funds to support operations. This policy permits the use of total return (dividend and interest income and investment gains) at a rate (the spending rate) of the greater of $8,500,000, or 5.50% annually of the 16-quarter moving average fair value of the investment pool. The policy was amended in February, 2004, and calls for the incremental reduction of the spending rate by 25 basis points from the historical rate 6% to 5%. This policy change facilitates the appreciation of the value of the endowment and brings the College’s spending rate in line with other institutions.

Along with the College’s enrollment growth, both the number of faculty on appointment and the number of appointments to instructional staff positions (lecturer, instructor) has increased. As a result, while enrollments have increased, the College was able to reduce faculty:student ratios (see Chapter VII for a more extended discussion of the size and composition of the faculty and related issues).

In addition, it is agreed that to remain competitive, Teachers College needs to increase student aid still further, although progress was made during this period. Student aid increased from 18% of total tuition and fee revenue in 1996 to 20% in 2004.

Over the course of the past nine years, much work has been performed on the College’s aging physical plant, both to address deferred maintenance and renew facilities. More than $137 million in capital expenditures have been invested during this period utilizing portions of operating budget surpluses, gifts from the capital campaign, and proceeds from two bond issues, including approximately $40 million for the construction of a new 252-unit student residence hall that opened in September, 2004.

In summary, the College has achieved budget surpluses in each of the past 11 years. Generally, rising revenues have been caused by increases in the number of students, the number of credit points taken, and the rising tuition revenues from those credit points. The caution that accompanies those rising revenues is that the trends will slow or reverse.

Expenses have kept pace with revenues as new faculty have been recruited and efforts have been made to improve faculty compensation. Endowments have also increased, although endowment growth and the take-down rate determining endowment income in the annual operating budget remain areas of concern. Again, it is conceded that the College has too much dependence on tuition revenues in its budget. Higher auxiliary enterprise revenue and increased endowment income are also much needed.

Finally, significant amounts have been spent on addressing deferred maintenance and improving Teachers College’s buildings and systems. Overall, funds during this period have
been spent in important areas to improve the College, but budgets continue to be tight and choices of where to spend precious resources remain the constraining elements characterizing the College.

The fourth goal articulated by the Strategic Planning process is to improve all aspects of the student experience. The College would accomplish this goal by:

- Increasing financial support for students;
- Improving core student services as they impact on the student experience;
- Developing effective, sensitive institutional systems; and
- Providing better facilities and equipment.

Today, the College enrolls 5,070 students in more than 65 areas of study, leading to the Master of Arts, Master of Science, Master of Education, Doctor of Education, Doctor of Education in College Teaching, and Doctor of Philosophy degrees. In accomplishing its mission, Teachers College strives to be an excellent, thoroughly diverse, and multicultural graduate and professional school. It makes urban and minority issues prominent features of the College program as a whole, of its research and training efforts, and of the recruitment and retention of both faculty and students.

The mission, activities, and characteristics of the College are the contexts which shape and define its student life. Student services and student life programs at Teachers College have been organized to assist the College both in meeting its goals for the size, character, and composition of the student body, and its overall objectives and goals for student outcomes.

At Teachers College, “student life” encompasses a broad set of factors which can complement and extend the goals of the academic program, including not only co-curricular issues (intellectual and scholarly quality of life outside the classroom), but also issues more directly related to the academic program (academic advising, career counseling, easy access to faculty, appropriate class size), to student services (student aid, financial services), and to instructional support services (library, computing facilities). The College uses an array of assessments, from ongoing surveys and focus groups to Town Meetings, to gather information from students about their experience at the College and the ways in which that experience might be improved. Most recently, the exploration of this theme with students suggests that while much has been accomplished, much also remains to be done.

Notwithstanding successful Capital Campaign efforts to increase financial aid resources, scholarship aid as a percent of tuition revenue in the operating budget remains at a noncompetitive, low level. At present, approximately 25% of currently enrolled students receive scholarship support, and the average award supports less than half the cost of tuition. The impact of continued under-funding for student aid can be devastating to the College. This past year, with the growing number of applications and the demand for programs at the College, admissions to programs of study were more selective. However, largely because of more competitive offers of financial aid from other institutions, the College’s yield rate among the “best of the best” declined, and the melt rate—the proportion of students who had promised to register but did not enroll—increased sharply.
In order to recruit, admit, enroll, and retain a diverse and highly-able student body who successfully complete their degree programs, the College not only requires substantial additional aid resources, but must be able to distribute that aid in a broader array of financial aid packages that are more competitive with peer institutions. In addition to establishing competitive financial aid packages, financial resources are also needed to support students’ professional development (e.g., funds for attending professional conferences and delivering papers) and research agendas. At the doctoral level, the lack of adequate support for dissertation research, particularly at the critical early stage following approval of the dissertation proposal, presents a serious impediment and extends the time of degree completion.

The College’s environment and institutional climate are the key determinants of the quality of student life, and the extent to which the College provides students with a supportive environment is critical to the quality of the student experience. Institutional services and infrastructure must facilitate students in their entry into and completion of their degree programs. They must assist students in resolving the various stresses associated with graduate and professional studies, and must promote their personal as well as professional development.

What differentiates Teachers College students who report a successful, positive student experience from those who do not? The key seems to lie in qualitatively different experiences at the program or department level, the primary community for each student. Program and departmental efforts to integrate students socially as well as academically into the community of the department are powerful determinants of the quality of student life. Providing support to these academic communities—through resources, facilities, and reward systems—is a crucial component of improving the quality of the student experience. Several aspects of College-wide services and support structures have an important impact on this perceived quality of the student experience; these include the condition of facilities, the extent to which service offices are perceived as student-centered and service-oriented, and the availability of services at convenient times and places. In addition, another key contributor to the quality of the student experience is offering students opportunities to become involved in decision-making processes on issues affecting them, to be listened to and heard, to be treated as valued members of the educational community, and to have fair and timely resolutions on the issues and concerns they raise.

In this context, Teachers College envisions a complete re-engineering of student services, utilizing the opportunity presented by new physical space to operationalize a new approach to providing integrated, comprehensive student services. Improving the quality of the student experience, however, requires more than improvements to these core services. Also needed are more robust systems and a re-engineering of work flow and work processes that support direct student service functions (e.g., financial aid); academic advisement (e.g., Web for Faculty, which would provide faculty advisors real-time, online access to student records for advisement and program planning); and, outcomes assessment (e.g., electronic portfolio systems linked to degree program requirements and professional standards).

During the planning stages for the Capital Campaign, students were provided with an opportunity to comment on and rank the emerging financial priorities. Not surprisingly, 53% ranked financial aid as their first priority for the Campaign, while 30% ranked facilities and technology as their first priority.
Annual surveys of student satisfaction and periodic focus groups and surveys on the
deson the presence of a strong student concern for and support of
initiatives that seek to improve campus facilities—from the bricks, mortar, roofs, gutters, and
windows that comprise the shell of the College’s buildings, to the quality of the classrooms and
instructional and support service facilities, and easier access to current technologies.

Major improvements have already been made, particularly with respect to the physical
and technological infrastructure of the College. Several instructional and event spaces (the
Milbank Chapel and 177/179 Grace Dodge have been extensively renovated and refurbished).
The first phase of renovation to the Gottesman Library has been completed, and planning for the
last phase is underway. The project to remodel the Horace Mann Auditorium and convert
surrounding offices to provide additional instructional space is underway. Notwithstanding these
renovations and the work in process, the day-to-day experience of students is still largely defined
by classrooms that are poorly furnished and in disrepair. Outmoded or inoperative technology
support, improved but still lagging access to technology (particularly a more robust integration of
technology into instructional and research programs), and a scarcity of space are all important
issues that remain to be addressed.

The fifth goal articulated by the Strategic Planning process is to make the College
operate more effectively. The College would accomplish this goal by:

- Organizing to support goals;
- Evaluating all programs and making necessary changes;
- Adjusting governance practices;
- Continuing to develop a more diverse community with a shared mission;
- Investing in the development of the professional capabilities of all members of the
  community; and
- Improving decision-making.

During the past 10 years, Teachers College has addressed a number of operational issues.
Strengthening the College’s academic programs has been accomplished in several ways. The
academic departments and divisions were redesigned and reorganized into nine academic
departments. The College has increased the quantity and quality of its faculty and the number of
minority post-doctoral fellowships. Research and development initiatives were created,
including centers on family and children, urban science education, privatization, Chinese
education, the Heritage School, the National Academy for Excellent Teaching, and a colon
cancer screening project, to name a few.

Another accomplishment over this 10-year time period was the rebuilding of the financial
systems at the College. The College’s administrative systems were also strengthened, leading to
improved services in the Controller’s Office, the physical plant, food services, the registrar, and
the bursar’s office. Improved services for students with disabilities have also been put in place.
In addition, the quality of senior and mid-level administrative staff was enhanced.
Perhaps the most noticeable change in the College over the last 10 years has been the impressive improvements in the physical plant, which had suffered over $100 million in deferred maintenance in prior decades. In addition, the College began the task of updating its instructional technology. A discussion on initiatives and accomplishments relative to the College’s improved facilities is also included in Chapter III (Standards 4 and 5).

Enhancements to the development operation generated additional endowment resources and culminated, in 2003, in a successful Capital Campaign that provided $154 million in new funds for the College.

The College has worked to strengthen its human resources by enhancing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students. In response to the report of the College-wide task force on diversity, the College established the Office of Diversity and Community. The Director of that office, who also serves as Special Counsel to the President, has implemented remedies for some of the problems identified in the task force report, and has worked with faculty, staff, and students to create an agenda of events and activities to develop the College’s sense of shared community.

The College has strengthened its Board of Trustees by recruiting and retaining active and committed stakeholders who exhibit genuine concern for the College. Teachers College has also succeeded in becoming more visible by an increased presence in local and national media through the writings of its scholars, including President Arthur Levine, and through the activities of the Office of External Affairs.

Although the College has made significant operational improvements over the last several years, many of these changes have yet to be systematically evaluated. As part of the strategic planning process, surveys and interviews were conducted, and lengthy discussions took place to identify further operational needs. The process identified a number of areas that must be addressed for the College to operate more optimally. The data collected indicated that Teachers College needs more clearly-defined goals, priorities, and values, and that a variability in the quality of its academic programs and curricula still exists. The institution needs improved equipment and technology. Although improvements were noted, Teachers College should continue to address community-building and shared values. The new Office of Enrollment and Student Services needs to be fully supported. Competencies in the management of various administrative offices and academic departments and programs need to be assessed and strengthened. Communications among departments and overall administrative information flow need improvement. Finally, performance evaluation processes for faculty and staff (professional and union) must be consistently implemented and utilized as career development “ladders” are conceived and constructed.

In sum, while the last 10-11 years at Teachers College have witnessed great activity and production, more work remains to be done. Our institution-wide strategic focus on educational equity should be reflected in all areas of the College, including systems of recognition, reward, communication, decision-making processes and structures, and concomitant structures that cluster and coordinate the work of students, faculty, staff, and administration. All stakeholders in the Teachers College community must continue to work together to ensure that its teaching,
research, and service “products” reflect the College’s ability to “walk our equity talk” internally while also striving to do the same in the larger world.

**Recommendations**

As part of the planning process that led to *A Strategic Plan for Teachers College, 2004*, the College adopted an institutional focus on educational equity and, in 2005, adopted a redefined mission statement aligned with the institutional emphasis on educational equity. Implicit in this chapter’s review of the strategic planning goals and the 21 initiatives identified to accomplish those goals is a recommendation, foundational to our complete self-study, that the College sustain its commitment to and engagement in accomplishing those goals and initiatives over both the near-term and longer-term phases of the strategic plan.

Each of those goals and the supporting initiatives are not repeated here as separate recommendations. Rather, the following highlights areas that received particular attention in this section of our self-study report. Recommendations related to other specific goals or initiatives in the strategic plan are developed in subsequent chapters.

Clearly, with the recent announcement of President Levine’s decision to step down as president of Teachers College, a first priority is the successful completion of the search for his successor. Our review strongly supports the importance of including as determining criteria in the search for a new president proven leadership in “pressing the agenda of educational opportunity” and demonstrated “experience and insight into the issues of educational equity” (Profile and Candidate Specification, President, Teachers College, Columbia University).

Also recognizing the challenges in sustaining the community’s commitment to and engagement with a multi-year set of initiatives, and recognizing as well that the strategic planning process to-date has been broadly participatory and transparent, we recommend that the College continue to engage all facets of the community in the ongoing implementation work around each of the initiatives, and actively keep the community informed of progress on or modifications to those initiatives.

As it falls into the “mission critical” category, our strong recommendation is that the College complete its transition from incremental, annual budgeting to long-range financial planning and budgeting processes that will assure the alignment of resource allocation with College goals and priorities. A companion recommendation supports the completion of the comprehensive modeling project to “right-size” enrollments and staffing at the College, including as a next step in that project the broader engagement of the academic programs in fine-tuning the model.

Continued improvements to the student experience at the College are at the forefront of many of the initiatives defining the strategic goals for the College. Over the near term, moving forward with the initiatives proposed by the technology priorities planning group, including continued improvements to the College’s physical teaching/learning environments, must be immediate priorities for the College.
The final recommendation focuses on student financial aid. In order to recruit, admit, enroll, and retain a diverse and highly-able student body who successfully complete their degree programs, the College not only requires substantial additional aid resources, but must be able to distribute that aid in a broader array of financial aid packages that are more competitive with peer institutions. Further, in addition to establishing competitive financial aid packages, financial resources are also needed to support students’ professional development (e.g., funds for attending professional conferences and delivering papers) and research agendas. At the doctoral level, the lack of adequate support for dissertation research, particularly at the critical early stage following approval of the dissertation proposal, presents a serious impediment and extends the time of degree completion.
CHAPTER III: INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

STANDARDS 4 AND 5
Leadership, Governance, and Administration

Introduction

This section of our self-study addresses two related aspects of institutional context: leadership and governance, and administration. With respect to leadership and governance, the report demonstrates how Teachers College’s system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. Further, the governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development consistent with the mission of the College. With respect to administration, the report describes the College’s administrative structure and functions, and illustrates how they support the academic programs of teaching/learning, research/scholarship, and service, while also assuring quality improvement and support for the College’s organization and governance. Materials in this chapter are also provided to address the following questions:

- How do the leadership, governance, and administration at the College foster the implementation of its mission, goals, and objectives?
- Do the existing governance and administrative structures provide support for student decision-making in matters related to the College as a whole, and specifically to the student experience?

Strategic Planning

As discussed in Chapter II, more than two years of dedicated effort by a cross-College Strategic Planning Committee, broadly representative of the College’s constituencies, produced A Strategic Plan for Teachers College, 2004 which identifies 21 specific initiatives to implement the College’s five strategic goals:

- We will increase the impact of Teachers College on the fields and the diverse constituencies that it serves.
- We will reestablish Teachers College as the premier school of education in fact and reputation.
- We will assure the long-term financial viability of the College.
- We will improve all aspects of the student experience.
- We will make the College operate more effectively and continue to honor and cultivate diversity throughout the institution.

The strategic plan is divided into two time periods, both containing several themes around which the specific initiatives have been developed. The first phase of the strategic plan—which is co-terminus with this self-study—has as its key objective the adoption of a primary institutional focus for the next decade and the alignment of the College to support that focus.
The Strategic Plan for Teachers College, 2004 addresses every aspect of the institution, including its programs, operations, facilities, and finances. It retains a strong focus and a set of clear institutional goals while leading the entire organization along a path of innovation, investment, expansion, and renewal. The strategic plan provides an important context for understanding and assessing the effectiveness of the College’s leadership, governance, and administrative systems and structures. Additionally, the planning process itself, the strategic plan that was produced, and the progress to date through the first phase all provide evidence of meeting Standards 4 and 5.

Leadership and Governance

Consistent with its mission, Teachers College has traditionally sought governance modes that provide for the effective participation of various sectors of the College community, both in the determination of policies guiding the life of the community and in the critical appraisal of the implementation of those policies.

This section includes descriptions of the Trustees, the President and Officers of the College, faculty participation in governance, student governance, and the role of other College community members in College governance. The section also addresses integrative mechanisms for engaging all constituencies in issues of cross-College concern.

Trustees

The Trustees of Teachers College currently consist of 32 members, with 35 being the maximum allowed by the Statutes of the College. The President of the College and the President of Columbia University serve as ex officio members. The remaining 30 members of the Board of Trustees represent a spectrum of American public and professional life.

All members of the governing board have a demonstrable interest in one or more of the areas for which the College prepares professionals. The Trustees bring the perspectives of several professional communities to their service on the Board. Several Trustees are prominent in the business community, particularly financial-related firms, international business firms, and foundations. They serve as chairpersons, chief executive officers, and presidents or heads of privately-owned business. A number of the Trustees are drawn from the educational community, including one of the country’s leading experts on child development, a nationally syndicated education reporter, the founder of a school leadership program, and the president of Science Weekly, Inc. Other members of the Board include individuals who are partners at major law firms and individuals who are actively involved in civic or community-service work. Of the current membership, 9 are graduates of Teachers College, 11 are women, and 5 are minority individuals.

Over the last five years, the Committee on Trustees has identified underrepresented areas of expertise and population, and proactively cultivated Trustee candidates to address these needs. The success of this effort has also resulted in a significantly heightened level of engagement by the Board, which has been nurtured by increasingly involving the Trustees in substantive discussions on issues of major institutional importance.
The Trustees serve without compensation. They exercise all of the authority vested in them by the Education Law of New York, the Charter (as amended) granted by the Regents of the University of the State of New York, and the Bylaws of the College.

The Trustees discharge their work through an executive and subcommittee structure illustrated in the following chart. The Board leadership reviews the performance of each Trustee at the end of each three-year term, before proposing a Trustee for re-election to an ensuing term.

The Committee on Compensation, for example, has responsibility to review the performances of and approve compensation for senior staff. It also has responsibility to review the performance of and approve compensation for all professional staff with annual salaries above $100,000. Lastly, this Committee is also charged with the responsibility of reviewing presidential performance and compensation. Similarly, the Audit Committee has the primary responsibility for reviewing the financial and management audit reports for the College.

As another illustration of the engagement of the Trustees with the College, in concert with the College’s initiative to focus on and improve the quality of the student experience, the Board of Trustees recently established an ad hoc Committee on the Student Experience, subsequently established as a formal standing committee on student affairs. The Student Affairs

---

1 Additional information of the Board of Trustees, including its composition and the specific charges of each of the subcommittees, will be available in the Resource Room during the site visit.
subcommittee has taken as its charge assisting the President and Dean in focusing attention on improving the student experience at the College. The Committee is comprised of seven Trustees, with the Associate Dean for Enrollment and Student Services serving as the primary administrative liaison to the Committee. The early work of the Committee, established in Fall of 2004, has focused on the new student experience, and in concert with the Office of the Dean and the Office of Enrollment and Student Services, has contributed to a major redesign of the student orientation program. Discussed in greater length under Standards 8 and 9, the redesign initiative has focused on lengthening orientation from one day to five days, and within that expanded time frame providing a set of experiences that not only offer an introduction to essential administrative services and functions, but perhaps, more importantly, that engage students, across discipline and program, with core institutional values.

At its October 6, 2005, meeting, the full Board approved the following new mission statement that was the result of the work of the Strategic Implementation Team, which included the Board Co-Chairs:

Teachers College is dedicated to promoting equity and excellence in education and overcoming the gap in educational access and achievement between the most and least advantaged groups in society. Through programs of teaching, research, and service, the College draws upon the expertise of a diverse community of faculty in education, psychology, and health, as well as students and staff from across the country and around the world.

The current President of the College, Arthur E. Levine, speaking at the annual State of the College Address on September 14, 2005, announced that he would be stepping down from the presidency on July 1, 2006. His departure will cap a 12-year term during which the College tripled its endowment; improved its bond rating; refurbished and rehabilitated its existing physical plant and built a new student residence hall; reorganized its academic departments and strengthened its Faculty and Board of Trustees; successfully conducted the largest capital campaign ever undertaken by a graduate school of education; and, adopted a new mission focused on educational equity.

With respect to presidential selection, Article III, Section I of the College’s Bylaws, stipulates the following:

The President shall be appointed by the Trustees with the advice and consent of the President of Columbia University and shall serve for such term as the Trustees may determine.

For the purposes of the above paragraph, the Chair shall appoint a search committee. Such committee shall be composed of, but not limited to, Trustees, Faculty, students, and alumni, all of whom shall be voting members of the committee. Any Faculty members serving on the committee shall be elected by the Faculty. All committee members shall act independently.

Following President Levine’s announcement, the Trustees initiated the process of seeking his successor. Nominations and elections for Faculty representatives to the Search Committee
were completed in October, 2005. In a November, 2005, communication to the Teachers College community, the Trustees reported that a Search Committee comprised of Trustees, faculty, students, and alumni has been constituted, and the search firm of SpencerStuart has been retained to assist the College in its effort. To ensure that lines of communication remain open as the search proceeds, the Trustees established an email address (searchcommittee@tc.edu), which members of the Teachers College community can use to express comments or concerns about the search directly to the committee. For nominations and applications, a separate email address was created (tcpresident@spencerstuart.com). Most recently, faculty representatives to the search committee held open meetings for the Faculty of the College to discuss the desired characteristics and qualifications for the new president. In the same vein, the Student Senate representative to the Search Committee solicited student input via an email survey that asked students their thoughts on the most important issues facing the College and what the role of the College president should be, particularly with respect to impacting the student experience at the College. The most recent update on the progress of the search was that it was proceeding well, that there was a strong pool of candidates, and that the search process was entering the first round of candidate interviews. The Search Committee is aiming toward the goal of successfully concluding the search by April, 2006.

The President and Officers of the College

Responsible to the Board of Trustees, the President is the chief executive officer of the College and, within the provisions of the Statutes, has full charge of the administration of the College. The President also serves as the executive officer of the Trustees.

The powers and duties of the President are described in the Statutes (a copy of which is provided in the materials accompanying this report). They include responsibility for the development of plans for all aspects of the College’s educational programs, services, and other activities; its physical facilities and equipment; and its financial management. With prior consultation, the President presents to the Trustees recommendations for the appointment and promotion of faculty in professorial rank and, subject to confirmation of the Trustees, appoints and assigns the duties of all other employees.

As illustrated in the chart below, included among the Officers of the College is the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College, who serves as the chief executive officer of the faculty. She exercises general supervision over the educational program of the College and, in the absence of the President, performs the duties and exercises the authority of the President. The Vice President for Finance and Administration serves as the chief financial officer of the College, and exercises general supervision over the administrative activities of the College and direct supervision over all activities related to business and finance, including budgeting. The Vice President for Development and External Affairs exercises general supervision over all activities of the College related to institutional development and external affairs. He also represents the College in its relationships with external institutions, agencies,

2The Search Committee roster and the presidential search case statement are available in the Resource Room.
and the public at large. Other officers provided for in the Statutes include the Chair of each instructional department, and the Secretary of the College.

![Organizational Chart]

Faculty Participation in Governance

Integral to accomplishing the mission of the College as a graduate and professional school of education, faculty participate in governance and the decision-making processes in several roles:

- as individual faculty within programs and departments;
- as program and department representatives to various cross-department or college-wide program committees;
- as elected representatives and appointees to faculty committees;
- as elected representatives to Columbia University governing bodies, including the University Senate and the Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences; and,
- as appointed or elected members of advisory boards, task forces or other cross-College committees.

The governance and authority structure frequently involves individual faculty in several of these capacities.

---

3The duties and areas of responsibility of each of the senior administrators are discussed in more detail in the following “Organization and Administration” section of this chapter.

4A roster for each of the major College Committees, Advisory Boards, and Task Forces on which faculty serve will be available in the Resource Room.
Faculty authority and participation in decision-making have several formal, statutory bases including the responsibility to fix requirements for student admission, the program of instruction, and conditions of graduation and the award of degrees, and to establish regulations for ascertaining the proficiency of students and for student academic discipline. Additionally, the faculty makes recommendations on policies regarding the purpose, priorities, and general allocation of College resources; provide systematic advice to senior administration in the preparation of the annual budget; make judgments concerning the extent to which the annual budget conforms with established priorities; and may submit those judgments to the Trustees along with the annual budget.

The Faculty meets in monthly plenary sessions during the Fall and Spring semesters. Between those meetings, the business of the Faculty is conducted by the Faculty Executive Committee which:

- receives, considers, discusses, and acts upon concerns and proposals as they relate to the educational programs of the College;
- consults with the President and other executive officers of the College on matters of interest to the Faculty; and
- formulates and carries out procedures for the discussion of program matters with the Faculty as a whole and as departmental groups.

The elected Faculty Governance Committee structure is illustrated in the preceding chart. With respect to the charge to each of the Subcommittees:

- *The Academic Program Subcommittee* is responsible for academic program policies and practices, including attention to the instructional program as well as research,
demonstration, and service. It reviews and assesses the development and implementation of program priorities, and makes recommendations to the Faculty Executive Committee and to the Dean about program changes as they may be developed within the various units of the College. It also evaluates and approves new course proposals.

Most recently, the Academic Program Subcommittee has developed and implemented new procedures for both new course proposals and new program proposals.5 With respect to new course approvals, the new process more closely aligns the approval of new courses with core faculty and degree program requirements, and reduces redundancy or overlap with existing offerings. With respect to new programs, the review process now more directly links new program approval with key indicators. These include demonstrated commitment to the mission and standards of the College; evidence of program need and students to be served with clear evidence of a sustainable market; lack of overlap or duplication with existing programs; the extent of competition among other institutions in the region; and clear staffing and budget plans.

- The Subcommittee on Academic Personnel represents the Faculty in matters pertaining to the formulation and implementation of personnel policies and practices, and among its concerns are policies regarding the recruitment, hiring, promotion, and tenure of professional, adjunct, and instructional staff, as well as working conditions and support services. The Subcommittee also plays an integral role in the review of requests for permission to recruit new faculty (discussed in more detail under Standard 10).

Most recently, the Academic Personnel Subcommittee has undertaken a substantive review of personnel policies and procedures for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and appointment to tenure.6 The review, which will continue through the 2005-06 academic year, focused initially on criteria for reappointment for new categories of positions at the College (Professor of Practice, Research Professor, non-tenure track, term appointments to faculty rank).

- The Subcommittee on Finance, Facilities, and Support Services functions in connection with the budget, library, technology support, and aspects of non-instructional staff. The Subcommittee works with the Dean and the Vice President for Finance and Administration to prepare an annual report on the proposed budget which, after faculty approval, is forwarded to the Trustees with the proposed budget.

Over the past academic year, in cooperation with the President, the Vice President for Finance and Administration, and the Dean, the Finance, Facilities, and Support Services Subcommittee were key actors in the development of a more open and transparent annual budget process. Similarly, members of the Subcommittee represented the faculty on the Long-Range Financial Planning Task Force.

5Copies of the new program proposal and new course proposal forms are included in the Faculty Handbook accompanying the self-study report.

6Copies of the personnel policies governing the appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion in rank are included in the Faculty Handbook accompanying the self-study report.
• *The Subcommittee on Race, Culture, and Diversity* seeks to identify and implement mechanisms for furthering discussions and recommending policy related to race, diversity, and culture at Teachers College and in the broader society.

The focus of the Race, Culture, and Diversity Subcommittee for the 2005-06 year is to engage the faculty with the Campaign for Educational Equity. In addition, the Subcommittee offers two grant programs through the Dean’s Office. The “Teachers College Faculty Diversity Research Awards Program” is available to full-time professorial appointees, including pre-tenure faculty, and supports faculty projects related to diversity, a single semester in duration, by providing: (1) salary, (2) release time from teaching, and (3) funds for a research assistant (or equivalent).

The “Faculty Fellowship Award on Teaching and Diversity” supports a Diversity Fellow who will assist the awarded faculty member in developing a proposed project on Teaching and Diversity. The fellow will receive a $3,500-per-semester stipend, plus 6 tuition credits for the academic year. Five of these awards are given each year.

Each of the Subcommittees makes recommendations to the President and Dean through the Faculty Executive Committee, as appropriate.

In addition to the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) and its standing Subcommittees, the Faculty has also established the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC). Its responsibilities are to initiate meetings with the President, the Dean, and other Officers of the College to represent the views of the faculty, to express a direct faculty voice with respect to salary policy and related matters, and to report the results of its work to the faculty. Most recently, the FSC has, at the request of the President and Dean, undertaken a review of alternative salary and compensation systems that might more effectively support the College’s mission as a Research I institution. Specifically, the FSC was asked how alternative approaches to compensation might give incentive to “meritorious” activities, positively affect faculty morale, address salary equity concerns, provide incentives/rewards for engaging in important and high-impact work tied to College priorities, maintain parity with the market to recruit and retain high-quality faculty across all fields, and encourage continued professional development.

Additionally, the Statutes also provide for the election of faculty to the Faculty Advisory Committee, which assists the President and the Dean in locating, discussing, and adjusting problems affecting academic appointees that, for any reason, cannot be satisfactorily resolved within regular administrative channels. The Committee also provides a hearing on the request of any member of the academic staff.

**Department Chairs**

Department chairs are members of the faculty and key participants in representing the views of faculty in cross-college forums and settings. Department Chairs are an important part of the academic leadership of the College and they participate in many governance and decision-making processes (e.g., changes to current programs, proposals for new programs, staffing and

---

7 Additional information on these programs, as well as other opportunities for research grants and fellowship support, will be available in the Resource Room during the site visit.
resource allocation decisions, etc.). The reorganization of the academic program, reported in our 1997 self-study, strengthened the role of department chairs in academic governance and decision-making.

As a group, Department Chairs provide an essential College-wide perspective, especially with respect to planning, personnel, budgeting, and the organization and functioning of the College. During each academic year, requests from each department for new faculty positions are reviewed by Department Chairs as a group. Recommendations are then forwarded to the Dean and the President with respect to authorizing new faculty recruitments. Department Chairs are also involved in the discussion and development of priorities for budget planning and the review of the annual budget.

The Chairs, as part of their role as faculty administrators and leaders of the instructional departments of the College, meet regularly with the Dean and the President to support the interests of the faculty and the College. The Chairs serve as advisory to the Dean and President on matters related to all of the College’s academic policies and procedures. The Chairs also advise on any other matters related to the interests of the College referred to them by the President or the Dean. In both their individual and collective roles, the Chairs’ commitment to open and shared decision-making and collaboration with department faculty and colleagues is expected.

Most recently, as the College has undertaken new initiatives in support of its mission—Strategic Planning,8 Long-range Financial Planning,9 and the development of a more inclusive and transparent annual budgeting process, representatives of the Department Chairs have served on each of those three initiatives. As a means of improving communication and cross-area planning and coordination, Department Chair representatives have also participated in the annual Senior Staff retreat.10

Student Governance

The present forms of student participation in College governance and decision-making occur at a number of interrelated levels. The primary vehicle for student participation in governance is the Student Senate. Over the past five years, there has been a successful student initiative to revitalize the Student Senate as an effective vehicle for structuring student participation in both student and College governance.

---

8Strategic planning was discussed in more detail in Chapter II.
9Both the Long-range Financial Planning initiative and improvements in the annual budgeting process were also discussed in more detail in Chapter II.
10The College’s Senior Staff (the President, three Vice Presidents, Secretary to the College, and the General Counsel) conduct a two-day, off-site planning retreat each summer. The purpose of this exercise is twofold: first, the previous year’s statement of goals and objectives for each specific administrative area, as well as the overarching set of goals for the Senior Staff as a group, are reviewed in terms of how effectively they have been addressed within the past academic year; second, a statement of goals and objectives for the coming year for each of the group’s constituent elements is presented and discussed, and from that discussion, an overall set of priorities for the Senior Staff is established for the coming year. Additional individuals and/or groups (academic department chairs, administrative department heads, Trustees, consultants) are invited to join the Senior Staff discussion when appropriate.
The Charter of the Student Senate defines its primary foci, including:

- ensuring the rights of students by functioning as the officially elected student council;
- effectively representing the student body in the initiation, development, establishment, and reform of policies, programs, and finances at Teachers College;
- promoting the social and general welfare of the student body;
- serving as the representative, advocate, and liaison of the student body to both the Teachers College and Columbia University communities; and,
- gathering and expressing student opinion while fostering communication on College-wide issues.

As the College-wide body with Student Senators elected from each department, the Student Senate provides linkage between the Senate, which focuses on broader College-wide issues, and the more focused concerns of students within individual departments. The Student Senate also coordinates student representation on College-wide standing and ad hoc committees. Most recently, through the initiative of the Student Senate, Teachers College students gained voting representation on the Columbia University Senate.

The work of the Senate is coordinated through four standing committees (see chart). Each of the committees is responsible for various aspects of advocating for students:

- **Institutional Affairs** is concerned with administrative issues between students and offices in student services, or administration.
- **Student Life** is mainly concerned with providing opportunities for students to build a sense of community and enhancing the life of a student while at Teachers College.
- **University Affairs** is concerned with relationships impacting students between Teachers College and Columbia University.
- **Academic Affairs** deals with issues between students and faculty.

The Student Senate meets in plenary sessions during the Fall and Spring semesters. Between those meetings, the business of the Student Senate is conducted by the Executive Board.

Student input on important issues is also assured in a number of other ways. One vehicle includes Town Meetings, which President Levine initiated shortly after assuming the presidency.
of the College. These forums have provided an effective vehicle for two-way communication and dialogue on important College issues and developments as well as issues and concerns of importance to students.

Students also have effective input with respect to the evaluation of teaching, both College-wide and departmentally. Student evaluations of courses have been and remain integral part of the dossier that individual faculty submit for reappointment, tenure, and promotion reviews. Similarly, many departments and programs query students systematically and regularly about the strengths and weaknesses of courses and programs. In addition, the personnel policies governing the reappointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty specifically provide for student assessments and evaluations as a critical component of each of those decisions.

The form and nature of student participation vary considerably across the 9 departments and more than 65 programs. In some programs, for example, students have formal representation to the program curriculum review committee; in all instances, student representatives participate in new faculty search committees. In addition to opportunities to participate in governance within the academic program, student participation is also routinely sought in non-academic matters as well. For example, student input was actively and consistently sought throughout the development of plans for the new student dormitory, and both design and program decisions were influenced by their participation. Similarly, in 2002, a substantial gift was received for the purpose of renovating the student computing lab. After preliminary design meetings with the architects, input from students who use the lab as well as student consultants working in the lab was sought, and specific design alterations were made to reflect the student preferences expressed in that process. Student input also routinely informs decisions about instructional technology and the courseware platform, assuring a better fit with student needs.

Finally, several other deliberate institutional efforts are made to periodically question students about their experience. For example, the Office of Institutional Studies annually conducts surveys of new and continuing students about their perceptions and satisfaction with all facets of their experience as graduate students, including their academic programs and the whole range of student and instructional support services. The reports of these surveys provide an important basis for directing service improvement efforts and for gauging the success of those efforts over time. The recent redesign of the orientation experience for new students is an example. Specifically, following the Fall, 2004, new student orientation, the Office of Institutional Studies surveyed new students about their initial experience at the College. As a result of the findings from this survey, the orientation program for Fall, 2005, was significantly changed with respect to both format, range of programs and activities, and schedule (activities and programs were distributed over five days rather than one day).

Professional Staff

Members of the professional staff of the College convene two or three times annually as the Professional Staff Assembly. The purpose of the Assembly is to provide a forum to discuss all issues affecting the professional and economic welfare of the professional staff of Teachers

---

11 A copy of the Personnel Policies is included with materials available to the evaluation team in the Resource Room during the site visit.
College; to formulate and communicate the consensus achieved by the membership on these issues; to encourage a sense of empowerment and cohesion among professional staff; and to ensure accommodation of the diversity of the professional staff in appropriate areas of College governance. The guiding body of the Professional Staff Assembly is a nine-member Executive Committee, which is elected by the members of the Assembly for staggered two-year terms. The Executive Committee sets agendas and proposes goals concerning salary, quality of life, and College governance.

The Professional Staff Assembly also completes much of its work through two Subcommittees: the Subcommittee on Compensation, which serves as the intermediary in discussions with the administration on matters relating to salary and benefits; and the Subcommittee on Appointments, which promotes opportunities for representation, solicits nominations, interviews candidates, and recommends appointments to the Executive Committee for professional staff representation on College committees or for additional representation on the Executive Subcommittee.

Another vehicle for the participation of professional staff in policy formulation and implementation is the Management Network. The Network is composed of directors and managers representing all major operational areas of the College. The group was created in 1996 to provide a vehicle for sharing ideas on policy and as a conduit to improve information flow—upward, downward, and laterally—within the institution. The Network acts as a catalyst for the recommendation of new policies and procedures, and for proposing changes or modifications to existing policy. It also serves as a forum that provides opportunities both for the presentation of new initiatives as well as demonstrations from individual units or offices on existing procedures or functions.

The Management Network has been instrumental in several initiatives, including the development and refinement of the annual professional staff performance appraisal process and, more recently, the development and implementation of a cross-College framework for the creation, review, and implementation of new administrative policies. Briefly, the “policy on policies” establishes the Policy Advisory Group and charges it with the responsibility to respond to the perceived need for administrative policy and manage a policy development and review process that assures multiple opportunities for review and comment by appropriate constituencies on proposed policies and operating procedures, incorporating feedback into subsequent revisions. The process provides for an explicit comment period during which the

---

12 The Professional Staff Executive Committee (PSEC) recently proposed to the Professional Staff a constitution to define more clearly the roles and responsibilities of the PSEC. A copy of the proposed constitution is available in the Resource Room.

13 The roster of Management Network membership, including title, office, and reporting relationship to the Vice Presidents, is included in the materials available in the Resource Room.

14 A copy of the policy is included in materials available in the Resource Room.
proposed policy is posted to the Teachers College community, and community feedback is factored into final iterations of the proposed policy. A key product is the development of administrative policies and procedures that are supportive of the College’s mission and goals.

Collective Bargaining Units

A further dimension of the College’s system of governance that clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies involves the collective bargaining agreements that the College has with three unions of the College. Specifically, the Highway Local Motor Freight Drivers, Dockmen, and Helpers Local Union No. 707, which represents non-managerial employees in the Security and Facilities departments; the Technical Office and Professional Union Local Union No. 2110, represents all on-campus full- and part-time secretarial and clerical employees; and, the Service Employees International Union 32B-32J which represents service employees in apartment buildings managed by the College.

Formal participation in several of the governance structures of the College is delimited by labor law and related practices. For example, while the College has sought to implement budgeting and planning processes that are broadly representative of the constituencies of the College, members or representatives of collective bargaining units do not participate in management committees. The context behind this practice is based in labor law, which clearly differentiates between roles that are management in nature and solely union-related, and those that are required to be mutually agreed upon.

Nonetheless, members of collective bargaining units at the College appropriately participate in policy development and decision-making in a number of important ways. For example, the strategic planning process in which the College has been engaged for the past two years provided for the engagement of all constituent groups at the College. Similarly, the creation of the Committee on Community and Diversity (see discussion below) has provided an important cross-College venue, which effectively structures the participation of faculty, students, administration, professional, and unionized staff at the College to invite and receive comments and suggestions from all sectors of the College on diversity, community, and civility concerns. As well, in cooperation with the Office of Diversity and Community and other College offices and units, the Committee develops initiatives that extend the College’s commitment to being a magnet institution that attracts, supports, and retains diverse students, faculty, and staff at all levels through its demonstrated commitment to social justice, its respectful and vibrant community, and its encouragement and support of each individual in the achievement of their full potential.

Cross-College Governance

The College has continually sought governance modes that provide for effective participation of various sectors of the academic community in the discussion, development, and implementation of College policies. Established more than 35 years ago, the College Policy Council was an innovative experiment in participatory governance in higher education that sought to provide an effective vehicle for all sectors of the College to be represented and govern together.

During the 1988-89 academic year, the College reviewed and redefined the scope and functions of this representative body, and established the College Policy Committee in its stead.
That review, which included consultation with faculty as well as representatives of the professional staff and Student Senate, concluded that the College Policy Council had not been effective in its broad policy-making and budget review authorities in a consistently effective way. In addition, because of the nature and structure of the College Policy Council, it had, ultimately and ironically, contributed to weakening College governance. At the same time, the review found specific areas in which the College-wide forum provided by the College Policy Council had been effective: affirmative action, library and computing services, student services, and health and safety.

Two broad functions were considered appropriate and important for the new body: providing an opportunity for communication between and among the administration, faculty, students, and staff; and providing an opportunity for consultation among these constituencies with respect to important issues of policy and operations that affect all constituents of the College. Along these lines, at the close of the 1988-89 academic year, amendments to the Statutes were proposed and accepted by the Trustees which eliminated the College Policy Council and created the College Policy Committee (CPC). The CPC was considerably smaller than its predecessor body (20 representatives rather than 40), and was consultative rather than legislative, with a clearer, narrower focus.

The new body was intended to provide an opportunity for communication among the constituencies of the College, and consultation among those groups with respect to important issues such as affirmative action, library and computing services, health and safety, community relations, and so on. The 1990-91 academic year was the first year in which the CPC was active and fully constituted.

Over the past several years, however, while the CPC remained “on the books,” it had become inactive, and this past May, 2005, the Board of Trustees approved revisions to the Statutes eliminating this body.

During the period that CPC was inactive, the College sought, successfully, to develop more effective constituency-based groups (e.g., Student Senate, Professional Staff Assembly, Management Network). The report of the Diversity Task Force in 1999 highlighted the need for creating and sustaining an effective, manageable cross-college committee with genuine authority and jurisdiction over limited issues. Since its inception in 2001, the Committee for Community and Diversity has provided, over the interim, for the continuation of a cross-college venue. During the 2004-05 academic year, the faculty have requested a review toward the possible re-establishment of the College Policy Committee.

Organization and Administration of the College

This section of Chapter III provides an overview of the organization and administration of the College and highlights important changes and developments following the 1997 self-study and the 2002 Periodic Progress Report. In addition to providing a brief discussion of the scope of responsibility of each of the senior administrators, and the functional areas reporting to each, this section also describes several aspects of the organization and administration of the College, including the organization of the academic programs of instruction and research, and instructional, research, and student support services. Discussion of the current financial condition of the
College, including current budgeting principles and guidelines, and initiatives related to facilities, housing, technology, and development and external affairs, including the successful capital campaign, were discussed at length in Chapter II concerning Standards 1, 2, and 3.

The chart below reflects the current senior administrative structure of the College. With the exception of the added position of Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Community, which was redefined in 2005 as General Counsel and Executive Director Office of Diversity and Community, the senior administrative structure of the College retains the structure that was implemented in 1985.

During the 1985 academic year, the management and administration of the College was in an important transitional period. The previous senior management structure of the College had consisted of the President, a Provost, and a Dean. Under this arrangement, the number of both personnel and administrative functions reporting to the Provost was too broad, precluding sufficient time for developmental management activity and proactive planning. The administrative and management structure was reorganized and provided for the three categories of senior administrative appointments in place today:

- Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean
- Vice President for Finance and Administration
- Vice President for Development and External Affairs

With respect to current appointments to these posts, as noted earlier, Arthur Levine, who was appointed President by the Trustees in July, 1994, has recently announced that he will step down from that post as of July, 2006. Of the other senior appointees, Joseph Brosnan was appointed Vice President for Development and External Affairs in June, 1995; Fred Schnur was appointed to the position of Vice President for Finance and Administration in July, 1995; and
Darlyne Bailey was appointed in January, 2002, as Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College. The post of Special Assistant to the President and Secretary of the College has been held by Scott Fahey since June, 1996. Janice Robinson was appointed as Special Counsel to the President and Director of the Office of Diversity and Community in September, 2000. Reflecting additional duties and responsibilities, her post was recently redefined as General Counsel and Executive Director, Office of Diversity and Community.

Notwithstanding the recent announcement of a pending change in presidential leadership, the overall stability of both the administrative structure of the College and the tenure personnel in key senior leadership posts has provided the opportunity to focus on functional and service improvements within the areas of each Vice President. In addition to providing a brief overview of each area, the discussion that follows highlights initiatives or accomplishments subsequent to the Periodic Progress Report, illustrating ways in which the administration of the College supports the programs of teaching/learning, research/scholarship, and service, while also assuring quality improvement and support for the College’s organization and governance.

**Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College**

The Statutes provide that the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College, who is the chief academic officer and acts as Chair of the Faculty, exercises general supervision over the educational program of the College, including all activities in the administrative areas of Instruction, Research, Field Service, and Student Services.

The areas of responsibility of the Dean are illustrated in the organizational chart that follows. The following discussion highlights major developments or changes, particularly in illustrating how those initiatives support the programs of teaching/learning, research/scholarship, and service, while also assuring quality improvement and support for the College’s organization and governance.

Teachers College, as a comprehensive graduate and professional school of education, offers programs in more than 65 areas of study leading to the Master of Arts, Master of Science, Master of Philosophy, Master of Education, Doctor of Education, Doctor of Education in College Teaching of an Academic Subject, and Doctor of Philosophy. Though originally provided for by the College’s charter, by action of the Board of Trustees in 1965, the College no longer offers programs leading to the baccalaureate degree.

As depicted in the organizational chart on the following page, instruction and research at the College are organized under nine academic departments. This arrangement reflects the significant change in the organization of the academic programs, implemented as an outcome of the mission review and restructuring initiatives begun in 1994-1995.

---

15For convenience, in the remainder of this report, the title “Dean” will be used where appropriate as a shorthand for the full title “Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College.”
The Structural Organizational Chart of Academic Affairs
Subsequent to our Periodic Progress Report, several important initiatives within Academic Affairs have been developed in support of the College’s programs of teaching/learning, research/scholarship, and service. The sections that follow provide a brief discussion initiatives in the following areas: the Office of Enrollment and Student Services, the Office of Teacher Education and School-based Support (OTESS), the Office of Accreditation and Assessment, the Office of Policy and Research, and the Gottesman Libraries.

Office of Enrollment and Student Services (OESS). The first initiative was the reorganization of several student and enrollment service offices into a new unit charged with a new service mission, and the subsequent creation of a new leadership position to oversee the area and direct the initiative. Historically, both enrollment and student service units had been spread across several areas of the College. In this initiative, Teachers College forged a new paradigm for graduate and professional education in creating the position of an Associate Dean for Enrollment and Student Services, who would be responsible for managing an integrated, unified suite of services directed toward improving the quality of the student experience at the College. As the senior Student Affairs Officer at the College reporting directly to the Dean, the Associate Dean works closely with other senior staff and in collaboration with academic department chairs, faculty, students, and professional staff across the College to implement and maintain an integrated division of student life and student services. The Associate Dean also provides leadership and supervision to the enrollment services, student affairs, and student service areas at the College, implementing a mission and vision for those areas that provide a framework for innovative and collaborative programs and services that meet the needs of a diverse student and academic community.

Additionally, with a team of student service professionals and Directors, the Associate Dean oversees departments impacting the quality of student experience from the point of inquiry, through to graduation including marketing, admissions, financial aid, registrar, and advisement. The Associate Dean manages a portfolio consisting of new student orientation and leadership development programs, student activities, student government, health and wellness programs, commencement, student conduct, career services, disabled student services, and international student services.

The newly created OESS is now in its second year of operation, under the direction of Associate Dean Donald Martin, who was appointed to the post in July, 2004, and has accomplished the following:

- Complete review of division organizational structure, resulting in the Office of International Services becoming its own department and reporting directly to the Associate Dean.
- Development of a division mission statement—the mission of the OESS at Teachers College is to create a smooth and seamless experience for all students at the College, from the point of initial inquiry to the point of graduation.
- Introduction of major customer service and cross-training initiatives within the division, which, according to students, were much needed. In just one year, complaints coming to OESS from current students has dropped by 50%.
• Increased interaction with students and the Associate Dean, who regularly attends meetings of the Student Senate (Teachers College’s student government); conducts open office hours and Town Hall meetings open to all students; and has, along with the Associate Dean for Academic Administration, developed a student intake process for handling individual student needs as they arise.

• Creation and implementation of student surveys—the annual incoming student survey conducted every Fall, and a more topical survey conducted each Spring, on an area within the OESS that is of particular importance to students. In Spring, 2005, the topical survey focused on the Office of Doctoral Studies.

• Development of a new marketing strategy and materials, including a new admissions recruitment video and expansion of Teachers College’s admissions recruiting efforts, both within the U.S. and abroad.

• Increased applications and enrollment yield for Fall, 2005, and reduction in the percent admitted for that same year.

• Assumption of managerial responsibility for the Petrie Fellows scholarship program, the publication of the Teachers College catalog, the Office of Doctoral Studies, and the Graduate Writing Skills Center.

• Development of preliminary proposals for alternate, centralized approaches to advising for Master’s-level students.

Office of Teacher Education and School-based Support (OTESS). A second initiative involved the reorganization of administrative functions and support services related to teacher education and other school- or field-based programs. The institutional context for this reorganization involved two key long-term processes: the first was re-registration with the New York State Department of Education of all programs that lead to teacher certification and certification as a building-level or district-level school administrator; the second was the successful pursuit of accreditation through NCATE. These two processes engaged Teachers College faculty and administrators in an extended period of self-study whereby programs were carefully reviewed and evaluated, assessments were revised and improved, and goals and practices were aligned with state and national standards.

The creation of a new unit and a senior administrative position reporting to the Dean was a direct result of the self-evaluation Teachers College undertook, and of the comprehensive changes in New York State Department of Education Commissioner Regulations, requiring the re-registration of all teacher and school leadership certification programs. Effective September 1, 2005, Professor A. Lin Goodwin was appointed Associate Dean for Teacher Education and School-based Support Services, overseeing certification compliance as well as support services for student teaching, supervision, and school placements. This new position and office also underscore Teachers College’s commitment to providing improved services to the large number of students enrolled in scores of teacher preparation/certification programs across at least five departments of the College.

Given the significant role these professional programs occupy at Teachers College, this new unit and new leadership position will further strengthen teacher preparation by providing
improved coordination among academic departments, teacher candidates, and the State Department of Education, thereby ensuring that programs prepare quality candidates who not only meet but exceed state requirements for certification.

Office of Accreditation and Assessment (OAA). The confluence of the re-registration of all school-based programs, the self-study project that was part of seeking accreditation with NCATE, the subsequent Middle States self-study with which we are currently engaged, and the annual cycle of individual program accreditations led to a third initiative—the creation and staffing of the Office of Accreditation and Assessment (OAA). The office serves the following functions:

- Coordinate college-wide self-studies in preparation for continuing accreditation by NCATE and the Middle States Commission, prepare periodic reports to these agencies, and organize site visits;
- Assist academic programs in self-studies and external program reviews by specialty professional associations;
- Facilitate continuing data collection on student learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness for internal improvement and external accountability/accreditation purposes;
- Maintain electronic databases and collections of records and documents associated with the accreditation of Teachers College and individual academic programs;
- Facilitate collaboration among programs and offices within the College in designing and conduction evaluations; and,
- Promote culture of assessment and accountability at all levels of the College.

Dr. Alexandra Gribovskaya was appointed Director of OAA in September, 2005. The Director and Associate Director work closely with academic programs and administrative offices within the College to ensure continuation of the assessment efforts initiated by re-registration and NCATE accreditation.

Office of Policy and Research (OPR). Policy work at Teachers College has commanded much attention over the years. Recently, with the new focus on federal and state policy and greater policy demands being placed on localities and districts, teachers and administrators who once conceptualized policy as remote from their sphere of interest or influence are becoming increasingly concerned about it. Such concern is heightening attention to, and hastening calls for, a more systematic understanding, study, and analysis of policy at teacher preparation institutions. Teachers College, long at the forefront of rich educational discourse, is not immune to these major shifts. As such, in this third initiative, the College has embarked on a series of new efforts to assess and improve its policy salience and research capacities, and has created the Office of Policy and Research (OPR).

Under the direction of Professor Sharon L. Kagan since its inception in 2004, the mission of this new unit seeks to advance the generation, application, and dissemination of scholarly knowledge to improve social and educational conditions throughout the United States and the world. Internally, OPR seeks to enhance the research and policy capacity of Teachers College
students and faculty through: (a) the development and support of research and policy scholars and leaders; (b) the cultivation of an institutional climate that supports the development of unparalleled non-partisan policy-salient research; and (c) the meaningful and appropriate dissemination of that work. Externally, OPR seeks to advance the use of Teachers College-generated research to alert the nation to the most critical policy issues and to enhance the role and research of Teachers College faculty in constructing more effective and equitable social, health, and educational policies.

The Gottesman Libraries. At the time of the 2001 Periodic Progress Report, the College was reported to be engaged in a major effort to re-imagine and re-position the library as a key component of overall programs and services for students, faculty, and staff. Those efforts—which were broadly participatory—led to the definition of the following major roles for the Library:

- **The library as academic social space.** In this role, the library will serve as a major gathering place on the campus for groups of students and faculty engaged in academic endeavors, both in and out of classes.

- **The library as instructional technology leader.** In this role, the library will serve as a venue for leading-edge educational technologies. The library will be the place where new technologies are introduced and evaluated prior to being rolled out across the campus more generally.

- **The library as an environment to support student and faculty production.** In this role, the library will become more than just a warehouse for intellectual properties from earlier generations of students and faculty and from outside sources. It will become a comprehensive workshop, a location with facilities and resources to support the full range of students’ and faculty’s intellectual work.

To equip the library for these new roles, the library facilities in Russell Hall have undergone major renovations. The first phase of the renovations, a $20 million effort to redesign the ground, first, second, and third floors, was completed in the Fall of 2005. This phase created state-of-the-art facilities to support basic library services, including circulation, reference, digital reserve, reading areas, wired and wireless network connectivity, individual and group study areas, and instructional spaces.

Planning for the second phase of renovations is underway, with the goal of redesigning the facilities on the fourth and fifth floors of Russell Hall to provide state-of-the-art technology-intensive environments (studios, classrooms, labs, project spaces) to support students’ and faculty’s creative work. The conceptual design work for this phase is currently in progress.

Accompanying the redesign of the library facilities is a restructuring of library operations. The library has made a transition from being a unit organized around its large and diverse collections to a unit organized around a robust set of information and knowledge services to support students, faculty, and staff. The current set of service units and their functions are briefly identified below.

**Research and Information Services:**
• Provide online and on-campus research assistance to Teachers College Faculty and students (e.g., accessing and using library materials);
• Provide assistance/instruction to individuals, groups, and classes regarding library services (e.g., doing research, library tours, online tutorials);
• Provide support to students in online courses;
• Introduce new research tools;
• Educate library staff about the collections;
• Coordinate educational events and exhibits that support the library’s educational programs; and
• Develop an educational program about the Research and Information Services group’s primary purpose and services.

On-Demand Content:

• Fulfill faculty and student requests for materials;
• Manage digital course reserves; and
• Educate patrons regarding copyright, fair use, etc.

Teaching Support:

• Help departments and faculty improve and expand programs and course offerings;
• Provide pedagogical, technical, and content support to Teachers College Faculty members;
• Create learning/resource units/modules to supplement Teachers College’s face-to-face and online courses;
• Develop and provide support to online collaborative communities for learning and research;
• Provide pedagogical, technical, and content support to Teachers College students who intend to work in higher education;
• Provide fee-based pedagogical, technical, and content support to Teachers College alumni in higher education;
• Develop an educational program about the Teaching Support group’s primary purpose; and
• Offer a speaker series on new pedagogies.

Design Services:

• Provide self-service/non-labor intensive art and design support to Teachers College students;
• Facilitate the creation of Teachers College students’ curriculum materials (printing, layout, production);
• Offer low-end design services for multimedia projects;
• Provide design expertise and tools to individuals and/or groups to support design work in digital and print modes;

• Develop and manage gallery exhibits that support the library’s educational programs; and

• Develop an educational program about the Design Services group’s primary purpose and services.

Collaborative Solutions:

• Provide low-end/out-of-the-box solutions (e.g., tutorial/guide for effective group processes);

• Assist Library Instructional Support Group/Teachers College Faculty with collaborative/group work in classes;

• Provide facilitation/collaboration services to individuals and/or groups at Teachers College;

• Develop an educational program about the Collaborative Solutions group’s primary purpose and services; and

• Provide fee-based solutions-oriented consulting to non-Teachers College clients.

Publishing and Archiving Center (under development):

• Provide faculty and students with personal digital publishing/archiving support;

• Provide Teachers College groups (centers, projects, etc.) with expertise and tools to support digital publishing/archiving;

• Conduct and/or coordinate all future archiving for the College;

• Develop an educational program about the Publishing and Archiving Center group’s primary purpose and services;

• Develop electronic archiving systems for internal/external clients and foundations; and

• Provide fee-based digital publishing and digital archiving assistance to non-Teachers College clients.

The current roster of services is intended to change as the needs of student and faculty needs evolve. The library monitors use of all services and will expand or contract efforts to meet demand. It will also be active in studying student and faculty information and knowledge needs as a springboard to develop entirely new services.

Professor Gary Natriello, who served as the Acting Director of the library during the planning phase described earlier, was appointed as Director of the Gottesman Libraries in September, 2004. The Director and the library management team are advised by the Library Seminar, a group of faculty, administrators, and Trustees that meets regularly to review the operations of the library and to develop plans for the further renovation of the library facilities. In addition, the library seeks student participation and input in several ways. All part-time and many full-time staff at the library are also students at the College, and these staff members
provide regular input into the development of library services. The library offers student fellowships and awards to solicit new ideas for services. It monitors patron use patterns and adjusts services accordingly. The library also periodically surveys patrons to determine satisfaction levels and to identify emerging needs.

Looking more deeply into the future, the library anticipates further development of its service capacity, largely through the development and deployment of new applications designed to support teaching and research at the College.

Vice President for Finance and Administration

The Statutes provide that the Vice President for Finance and Administration serves as the chief financial officer of the College and, under the direction of the President, exercises general supervision over the administrative activities of the College and direct supervision over all activities relating to business and finance, including budgeting and other administrative services as assigned.

The organizational chart below reflects the areas of responsibility assigned to the Vice President for Finance and Administration. Significant developments and changes subsequent to the 1997 Middle States accreditation evaluation, significant obstacles or challenges, and responses or actions taken with respect to the evaluation team’s recommendations are presented by functional area where applicable.

In 1997, the principal financial and administrative challenges faced by the College were:

- The need to improve administrative leadership and staff performance;
- A $4 million accumulated operating deficit;
- Inadequate accounting controls and a lack of timely, meaningful, and accurate financial information;
- A deteriorating physical plant, resulting from decades of deferred maintenance;
- A need for higher-performing modern technology systems; and
- The general dissatisfaction of students, faculty, and staff regarding administrative services.

Improving leadership and staff performance in the area of Finance and Administration have been underlying factors in the accomplishments of the past eight years. Since that time, the following have been accomplished:

- Recruitment of new staff and leadership to create a highly-skilled and professional administrative team. This team has been in place, on average, for seven years, contributing to a stable and strengthened organization.
• Redesigned, streamlined, and improved administrative processes by improving automated support and staff training, shifting resources within the organization, and increasing accountability;

• Engaged in area-selective organizational development, such as:
  ▪ Restructured financial services to better reflect and serve the changing needs of the College community; split out the budget and planning functions from the Controller’s functions; developed and documented fiscal policies and procedures; and improved accounting controls;
  ▪ Transferred the management of facilities and custodial services in 1999 to Aramark Corporation; improved maintenance, operations, and custodial services in all academic and residential buildings; and improved training of all facilities staff; and,
  ▪ Continually increased and improved in-house professional training opportunities for staff, enhancing staff preparedness, increasing efficiency, and ensuring accountability.

Overall, the quality of leadership and staff performance has greatly improved in the past eight years, creating community satisfaction with administrative services and laying the foundation for other critically-needed improvements.

Eliminating the accumulated operating deficit and improving accounting controls and budgeting systems were the chief challenges in the areas of fiscal management. Accomplishments include:

• Eliminated the $4 million operating deficit in six years, based on prudent budgeting practices, improved financial accounting controls, and operating surpluses;

• Improved accounting policies and procedures, and supporting technology;

• Improved quality and timeliness of internal and external financial reporting, reducing the audit from over one year in 1995 to two months in 2001 and thereafter;

• Made significant changes in cash management and collections of receivables, improving the College’s cash flow and reducing its exposure to bad debt. This, in part, allowed the College to transfer almost $20 million to its endowment;

• Made significant changes in the College’s budget process and budget management systems such as:
  ▪ Developed an open, rational process for budget development that created stronger linkages between executive leadership and key faculty and administrative groups;
  ▪ Achieved operating budget surpluses since 1995; and,
  ▪ Implemented new financial reporting and forecasting techniques that provide more timely, meaningful, and accurate budget information to budget managers.

• In 2003, Finance and Administration collaborated with the Trustees to revise the College’s investment policy. The policy articulates clear investment objectives and
establishes a policy framework for achieving investment goals and fulfilling fiduciary responsibilities. It assists in effectively supervising and monitoring investment activities; and providing guidance to investment managers employed to manage assets on behalf of the Trustees. As fiduciaries for the endowment, Trustees are held to a “prudent investor” standard. A well-reasoned written investment policy that culminates in formal asset allocation and manager selection guidelines protects the endowment from ad hoc, market-driven departures from sound, long-term policy. Due to regular rotation of Committee on Investment members, a comprehensive investment policy provides for continuity of process.

- Based upon the substantial improvements cited above, the College’s bond rating was increased by two grades, from an A-3 to an A-1, by Moody’s Investor Services in July, 2002. This rating was reaffirmed in Summer, 2003.

- In 2004, the College completed a fit-gap analysis for a business continuity plan. This comprehensive analysis assesses the ability of each department within the College to continue operations during a crisis ranging from the immediate working area to a cosmopolitan setting. This living document is updated annually, with the goal of all critical gaps being met over time.

- In response to the numerous risks associated with operating a college in New York City and the challenges of a post-9/11 insurance marketplace, the College recruited a Risk Manager in the Spring of 2002. This position negotiates all non-employee benefit insurance lines and coordinates claims and loss recovery activities involving property and liability coverage. The Risk Manager is also responsible for developing risk awareness programs and maintaining the business continuity plan.

- Continued to advance the important role of Teachers College Press in strengthening the financial health of the College, such as:
  - Continually expanding the Press’s prestigious lists of authors, thereby maintaining the Press’s high national profile; and,
  - Dramatically increasing revenues over the past eight years, and increasing sales by 70% and net income by 250% during the period FY1997 to FY2005.

Eight years ago, the College faced serious problems with the physical and technology infrastructure. Through its Capital Improvement Program and its Technology Initiative, the College made dramatic improvements in these areas to improve the quality of life for its students.

Capital Improvement Program. For a period of more than 20 years prior to FY1997, the College made minimal investments into its physical plant infrastructure. The cumulative effect of decades of financial neglect and deferred maintenance cast the College into a condition not unlike a trauma patient, where immediate and rigorous actions were necessary to save its viability and ensure its future. The College was confronted with many challenges to reverse this trend. The cost of capital renewal was staggering. According to a study conducted by Mitchell Giurgola Architects in 1995, the preliminary estimate for the renewal of the physical plant was estimated to be $100 million.

In September, 2001, the College developed a preliminary Capital Improvement Program
(CIP) to develop a comprehensive needs inventory that included preliminary scopes of work and estimated budgets prioritized in four phases over a five-year period. The CIP identified 32 projects with a total estimated cost of $43 million. In addition to these projects were the construction of a new campus conference center and the renovation of the Russell Library.

The CIP was used as a basis for the issuance of $42,085,000 of tax-exempt bonds in August, 2002 (Series 2002 bonds). This bond issue was the impetus for accomplishing the following physical improvements:

- The replacement of all roofs and windows of the College’s academic buildings;
- Bringing all building facades into a state of good repair;
- Following the renovation of the College buildings’ shells, the renovation of over 100 offices and classrooms;
- The completion of extensive renovations to the “public face” of the College, through projects such as the Everett Student Lounge, the Main Hall entrance, and the Horace Mann Auditorium—the latter which is currently under construction;
- The installation of a new fire alarm system;
- Physical improvements incorporating many features to improve access and safety for students and employees with disabilities; and,
- Through a 2003 bond issue, the College’s financing of the construction of a $40 million, 252-unit residence hall for its students. This addressed, in part, a severe housing shortage at the College.

**Technology Improvements – Infrastructure and Beyond.** Bond funds were also instrumental in providing resources to implement a technology infrastructure improvement plan. Key elements of the technology infrastructure improvement plan, which was developed in response to extensive internal and external assessments, was the construction of a new campus network infrastructure that reaches every classroom, office, and residence. Completion of the 1996 Technology Plan established an infrastructure that has continued to support a host of advancements. In addition to those detailed in the 2001 Periodic Progress Report, key advancements over the past four years have included wireless networking, piloting of web-based workflow processes, and enhanced network security and privacy safeguards. More specifically, major accomplishments include:

- **Network and Public Access**
  - Ubiquitous wireless networking in all academic buildings, common areas of dormitories and off-campus sites has facilitated collaboration in classrooms as well as in outreach activities.
  - The Student Computing Support Center opened in 2002 replacing an old lab with had good computers and dismal working conditions. A substantial gift allowed reconfiguration to provide 20% more workstations with a larger, ergonomically designed space for each student. A glass wall
segregates a collaborative activity lab so that students doing independent work in the larger room are not disturbed.

- The renovated Gottesman Libraries opened in September, 2004, with the number of workstations increased by about 200% to 300.
- Nine additional multi-media rooms were equipped with a computer, VCR, speakers, and projector or large flat-panel screen. With 25 permanently equipped rooms, Media Services is providing mobile laptops and projector units for 54 other classrooms.
- High-end computers equipped for ease of access by disabled students have been installed in the Library. Laptops are loaned to disabled students for use in class. Planning is under way for an adaptive technology lab to support both academic programs and individual students.
- A new video-conferencing facility supports class, outreach, faculty professional and other activities.
- Secure, web-based access to folders on network file servers for remote access by faculty and staff facilitate travel and prepare for work in inclement weather and some disasters.
- Network security has been strengthened in numerous ways, most recently with installation of internal and external firewalling and substantial upgrades to intrusion detection and anti-virus systems.
- Revised user training and procedures as well as technical modifications have enhanced protection of enterprise data and non-public personal information.
- Campus data and telephone services have been extended to the Harlem campus and the New Residence Hall.

- Communication and Collaborative Processes
  - The integration of voicemail, email and calendars has enhanced collaboration and enables faculty and staff to better manage the challenge of the information glut.
  - Web-based processes for departments have replaced the paper input system to develop the schedule of classes and to enter events on the web calendar and eBoard, an electronic display at Main Hall entrance that will be replicated in other areas.
  - Electronic portfolios along with assessment tracking and analysis were developed to support ongoing summative and formative program assessment, beginning with the programs leading to professional licenses accreditation.
  - Web-based, work-flow enabled processing was initiated for reappointment of adjuncts to provide a proof of concept for and demonstration of this approach to streamlining administrative functions.
A new policy was adopted requiring students to activate their Columbia email accounts and take responsibility for messages delivered to them. This builds on the practice of using electronic delivery for communication regarding collaboration, career opportunities and special events and establishes it as the norm for course, program and other official information.

Eight years ago, the capacity of the residence halls was underutilized. Residents’ satisfaction was low, physical plant needs were high, leadership and staff performance needed improvement, and fiscal administration was poor. Some of the accomplishments since then include:

- Completed numerous renovations to student and faculty residential buildings, such as:
  - Major repairs including lead and asbestos decontamination, refurbishment of elevators, and installation of new floors, new walls, and new lighting;
  - Continued refurbishment of student and faculty apartments as they are vacated; and,
  - Refurbishment of common areas, including the procurement of new furnishings, creation of new computer labs in the residence halls, and installation of new laundry equipment.
- Occupancy rates have grown to the current rate of almost 99%.
- Enhanced campus security by staffing residence hall desks with security officers and installing card-access and electronic key management systems.
- The formation of a Campus Safety Committee that developed an emergency evacuation and operations plan as well as other safety initiatives.

Vice President for Development and External Affairs

The organizational chart below reflects the areas of responsibility assigned to the Vice President for Development and External Affairs. The Statutes provide that the Vice President for Development and External Affairs, under the direction of the President, exercises general supervision over all activities in the administrative area of Institutional Development and External Affairs and represent the College in its relationships with external institutions, agencies, individuals, and the public at large. In addition, the Vice President also works with the Strategic Planning Implementation Team to coordinate the long-range strategic planning process for the College, which currently includes projects on comprehensive modeling to study the make-up of the College, reviewing the College’s relationships with Columbia University, and launching the Campaign for Educational Equity to address the achievement gap in American education.

Since 1996, as part of a strategic effort to make the College and its achievements more visible to the nation and the educational community, the College has expanded its institutional development capacity, particularly within the areas of development and external relations. The results have been impressive, including not only the increased presence and coverage of the
College—its faculty, students, and programs—in various media, but also the increased success of fundraising efforts.

The following sections briefly highlight accomplishments in the areas of institutional advancement, post-campaign fundraising, strategic planning, alumni affairs, and external affairs.

The Executive Director of Institutional Advancement works in close collaboration with the Executive Director of Strategic Planning who supervises the Corporate and Foundation Relations team of two. In addition, the Development Committee of the Board meets four times annually and is supported by the Vice President of Development and External Affairs. The Trustees and President are active in the fundraising life of the College.

At Teachers College, Institutional Advancement includes the areas of major gifts, planned gifts, stewardship and research. One of the central activities of the past six years has been the highly successful Campaign for Teachers College.
The original objective was to structure a comprehensive campaign which focused on priorities that strengthened the infrastructure of Teachers College, faculty support, student aid, and renovation of an aging physical plant, as well as providing funds for new initiatives.

The Campaign for Teachers College. The Campaign for Teachers College exceeded its goal of $140 million by raising $154.6 million, the largest amount of money ever raised during a campaign by a school of education. The overall goal of the campaign was to provide financial support above and beyond normal fundraising to enhance the College’s programs of teaching and learning, research and scholarship, and service.

The priorities of the campaign were designed to address core needs for renovation of an aging physical plant, more endowed professorships, student aid, and providing funds for new initiatives. The goal was to raise $140 million over a six year period. $100 million of that goal was set as a challenge to raise in “new” funds over and above the $40 million expected to be raised during the same time period had there not been a campaign. The allocation of this $100 million in “new” money was determined by the College’s board, President and a College-wide Financial Priorities Committee consisting of faculty, alumni, staff, students and administration. The seven College priorities driving the campaign and to which over $100 million in “new” money was designated were:

1. **Rebuilding the Morningside Heights physical plant:** the goal was to address decades of deferred maintenance and repairs, as well as refurbish in an appropriate historical and aesthetic context many of the College’s facilities.

2. **Scholarships:** the quality of our students directly impacts the quality of education in New York and in America. Financial aid at the College is not competitive with other top-tier institutions, either with respect to the size of the award or the proportion of students receiving scholarship aid.

3. **Attract and retain outstanding faculty:** in order to recruit and retain an excellent faculty and provide exceptional instruction, the College needs the financial ability to offer the honor and recognition that endowed chairs bring.

4. **Technological improvements and distance education:** the continuation of the College’s tradition of scholarship, teaching and service depends on our ability to extend the reach and influence of the College in the 21st century through technology and other means.

5. **The President’s Innovation Fund:** over the six years of the campaign, opportunities and priorities were anticipated to change.

6. **Academic programs:** this allocation will support current and new academic department initiatives as developed by faculty department chairs.

7. **Improvement in the quality of student life:** the College strives to improve the intellectual and social environment for its students through sponsoring students’ participation in conferences and professional development programs, by creating an environment where people with disabilities have equal opportunities to interact with
and contribute to the campus culture, and by expanding its ability to provide child care.

Success of the Campaign. Toward the above seven priorities, the campaign generated $154 million. Below are a list of those successes and represent just a sample of the programs and research opportunities that the Campaign for Teachers College helped our faculty and students develop and implement. Specific examples of programs or initiatives include:

- 80 new current-use and endowed scholarships to attract and retain outstanding students and to offer financial support to those who otherwise would not be able to afford a Teachers College education. The campaign also enhanced existing scholarship funds.

- 9 new endowed professorships established
  - Lucy McCormick Calkins
    *Robinson Chair in Children’s Literature*
  - Jeanne Brooks-Gunn
    *Virginia and Leonard Marx Chair in Child and Parent Development Education*
  - Pedro Noguera
    *Laurie Tisch Distinguished Visiting Professor*
  - Pearl Rock Kane
    *Klingenstein Family Chair for Advancement of Independent Schools*
  - Ruth Vinz
    *Enid and Lester Morse Professor in Teacher Education*
  - Thomas Sobol
    *Christian A. Johnson Professor of Outstanding Educational Practices*
  - Robert O. McClintock
    *John L. and Sue Ann Weinberg Chair in Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Education*
  - Sharon Lynn Kagan
    *Virginia and Leonard Marx Professor of Early Childhood and Family Policy*
  - Thomas R. Bailey
    *George and Abby O’Neill Professor Of Economics and Education*

- Physical plant renovation including the refurbishment of the following: the Gottesman Library, first floor of Main Hall; Everett Student Lounge; Everett Library Café; Student Computing Support Center; Milbank Chapel; Grace Dodge Hall as well as many new offices, classrooms with smart classroom technology, and furnishings. In addition, we
have received support to build a new conference room and event center, named the Cowin Center.

- Dozens of new outreach programs or existing outreach programs were significantly supported by the campaign, including:
  
  - **The Hechinger Institute on Education and the Media**
    Provides free seminars to journalists and educators to help maintain fair, accurate and insightful reporting about education by print and broadcast journalists.
  
  - **The National Academy for Excellent Teaching**
    Its mission is to establish a new national model of effective professional development for high school teachers that improves the achievement of underperforming and under-served students.
  
  - **The New Teacher Academy**
    Designed to enhance teacher effectiveness, improve teacher retention, and help school districts meet their professional development needs by providing vital support to beginning educators. The program has changed new teacher retention rates in some schools from 50% to 90% in just a few years.
  
  - **The Heritage School**
    A New York City public school that integrates the arts throughout its curriculum. It has become a model of an urban school with a high-performing student body.
  
  - **I USE Science**
    A project of our Urban Science Education Center in which College faculty and selected graduate students work with science teachers in high-poverty NYC public schools to introduce effective science teaching methods and create an inquiry-based science curriculum that is relevant to urban children.
  
  - **Peace Corps Fellows Program**
    In a collaboration between the New York City Board of Education, the Peace Corps and Teachers College, Returned Peace Corps Volunteers make a two-year commitment to teach in New York City public schools while earning a masters degree at Teachers College.

**Post-Campaign Fundraising.** Since the end of the campaign in September 2003, we have raised an additional $55 million in gifts, cash and pledges (as of January 6, 2006). As this figure shows, our fundraising efforts have kept the momentum of our successful campaign years. The College has received four consecutive 4-star ratings, their highest rating from Charity Navigator, the nation’s leading evaluator of non profits, for its proficiency in fundraising and its efficient use of the support we receive. The gifts and grants raised since September 2003 continues to enhance support for our faculty; assist programs and conduct research, shape policy and involve the College in the community; add to the College’s endowment; increase financial aid; and support ongoing renovation of the physical plant. It has also helped to provide a financial base for the College’s new initiative, the Campaign for Educational Equity.
Teachers College Annual Fund. Over the last 10 years, the College’s annual fund, or the TC Fund, has more than doubled. The fund continues to grow, currently raising over $1.5 million from almost 6,000 individuals. The fund plays an integral role in the College’s budgeting process, as each dollar raised is used to support vital initiatives in the areas of:

- academic programs,
- extra-curricular support,
- financial aid, and
- operations and maintenance.

The TC Fund is currently staffed by a Director and Assistant Director, reflecting the College’s commitment to reaching out to alumni in an effort to gain their financial support. The TC Fund also relies upon a volunteer “TC Fund Committee” in addition to departmental staff. The committee is chaired by a member of the Alumni Council and consists of between 7-10 members who help raise unrestricted dollars. All dollars raised through the committee are funneled through the TC Fund in support of the College’s current operating expenses.

The department utilizes various methods to raise TC Fund dollars. These include:

- direct marketing (including four large-scale solicitations per year);
- an outsourced Phonathon (contacting approximately 45,000 alumni per year); and
- face-to-face solicitations.

In order to increase participation in the Fund, the following programs have been expanded and/or implemented:

- Recent alumni participation;
- Faculty and staff giving;
- Gifts via the Web;
- Increased Trustee support;
- Face-to-face solicitations; and
- Enhanced cultivation/stewardship.

Strategic Planning. As noted earlier, the Vice President works with the Strategic Planning Implementation Team to coordinate the long-range strategic planning process for the College, which includes, among other initiatives: comprehensive modeling to study the make-up of the College; reviewing Teachers College’s relationship with Columbia University; and initiating the Campaign for Educational Equity to address the achievement gap in American
The College’s successful and ongoing engagement with strategic planning was discussed at length in Chapter II.

The strategic plan for Teachers College addresses every aspect of the institution’s focus, programs, operations, facilities, and finances in an ambitious but realistic and flexible way. It retains a strong focus and set of clear institutional goals, while leading the entire organization along a path of innovation, investment, expansion, and renewal.

Alumni Affairs. The College’s alumni are an impressive, diverse pool of talent that is perhaps the largest single network of education professionals in the world. There are 86,000 alumni (approximately 54,000 addressable labels), many of them pursuing careers in Clinical Psychology, Higher Education Administration, Organizational Leadership, and Nursing, and exercising leadership as teachers, school superintendents, principals, deans of colleges and universities, and researchers and scholars. In addition, many of our alumni pursue careers in the public sector.

The distribution of alumni in the nine departments at Teachers College are:

- Arts and Humanities: 12,645
- Biobehavioral Sciences: 3,244
- Counseling and Clinical Psychology: 4,144
- Curriculum and Teaching: 11,544
- Health and Behavior Studies: 7,065
- Human Development: 1,526
- International and Transcultural: 1,620
- Math, Science, and Technology: 5,260
- Organization and Leadership: 7,207

While pockets of alumni are scattered throughout the United States and abroad, the largest concentration of alumni are in New York State (21,714), New Jersey (5,954), California (2,574), Florida (2,360), and Connecticut (2,339).

The alumni are represented by an Alumni Council make up of 35 members and governed by a set of bylaws. The mission of the Teachers College Alumni Council is to advance the goals of the College by providing alumni with opportunities to remain actively involved in the life of the College and to build on the work begun as students and continued as leaders in their respective fields. The Council serves as partners with the Office of Development and External Affairs in advancing the goals of the College and securing volunteers and financial support to further its goals.

The office is comprised of two professional staff that supports the alumni and work to create a bridge between faculty, administration, and students and our alumni. This reflects the College’s commitment to extend and enhance the ties linking it with alumni and others that share a concern for education excellence and support our mission of educational equity.
Many initiatives and programs have put in place to support our alumni and to provide a link back to the College. Some have been in place for many years and some are new. Some of the more traditional programs include book talks, networking receptions, and homecoming. Over the past several years, a strong collaboration has been forged between Development and External Affairs and Career Services, working on the various mentor programs offered by the College; its purpose is to develop a Career Networking Program that actively involves alumni in creating networks that would assist students in various aspects of their careers.

The alumni also work closely with the Admissions Office to help in recruiting new students to Teachers College. Several of the new alumni-focused initiatives include developing a Recent Graduates program for alumni who have graduated within the last five years; expanding alumni regional clubs to better serve alumni around the country; building a strong international alumni network; and enhancing the Teachers College website to communicate more effectively with each other, locate lost classmates, continue to grow listservs for successful marketing events, and announcements of College news. Lastly, affinity-based academic programs will be developed to address the specific educational and programmatic needs of our alumni. This new initiative will focus on individual programs such as Higher Education Administration or Counseling and Psychology, and offer relevant information to alumni in their particular fields.

Office of External Affairs. The Office of External Affairs publicizes the research and scholarship of Teachers College Faculty members through its outreach to the media, and supports the learning and experience of students at the College through internal publications and the Teachers College Web, which the office maintains and administrates. In addition, during the past year, the office has been charged with providing communications and publicity support for the Campaign for Educational Equity, the research and action arm and public voice for the College’s mission of overcoming the nation’s educational achievement gap.

The College’s Faculty is considered among the finest in the world and are frequently sought, by both mainstream news media and the education press, for commentary on issues of the day as well as their own research. The Office of External Affairs has always publicized the Faculty’s work, but during 2005, it has gone even further to create a detailed news calendar that publicizes stories well in advance and responds to external events with opinion pieces, news alerts, and letters to the editor. The office has been particularly successful in placing op-eds during 2005, with pieces by Teachers College Faculty appearing in The New York Times, The Los Angeles Times, Newsday, Education Week, The Chronicle of Higher Education, and The Washington Post.

In seeking to put Teachers College “on the map” as an equity leader, the office has also explored more deeply into faculty research, “pre-digesting” it for reporters and placing it within the context of educational trends. Doing so was at the heart of the office’s success in publicizing the first annual Teachers College Educational Equity Symposium, for which a media booklet of research findings was created. The result was coverage in The New York Times and other major media outlets.

The office has also refined the Teachers College Web, both through the creation of a new content management system that allows for quicker, more coordinated news dissemination, but also through a more user-friendly format and more frequent postings of stories, press releases,
and updates. The result is that the Web is now a go-to source, both for outside media and the College community.

Finally, during 2005, the office has significantly enhanced the College’s three signature publications—a monthly bulletin for the on-campus community, an alumni magazine, and the Teachers College Annual Report—and increased distribution for all of them. The publications, which are sent to the media as well, have chronicled the training of teachers at the College; the trials and tribulations of being a big city principal; a national research project aimed at boosting the high school graduation rate for young black males, among other stories. The publications carry the image of the College out into the world, and the recent upgrades have received much positive feedback.

Recommendations

The reviews undertaken for this section of our self-study report, as well as those informing the discussions on related standards, affirmed that the College has a system of governance that defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making, and further, that the College has an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities for policy and resource development consistent with the College’s mission. The development and ongoing implementation of the strategic plan provides evidence of the effectiveness of leadership and administration in fostering institutional mission, goals, and objectives.

With respect to recommendations addressing leadership, governance or administration, we recognize the prerogatives of a new president to review the organizational and administrative structures of the College and to possibly recommend adjustments or changes. In that context, rather than offering specific recommendations regarding adjustments in organizational structure, we do recommend here that the organizational structures of the College, which remain largely unchanged from the reorganization in 1985, be reviewed to assure “best fit” with the new mission of the College and the initiatives outlined in the strategic plan.

A related recommendation involves the organization of the academic departments, research centers, and institutes. An earlier evaluation of the 1996-97 reorganization of the academic departments surfaced concerns in a number of areas (many of which predated the reorganization initiative). In the context of the new mission, the Campaign for Educational Equity and other initiatives in the strategic plan, and the pending appointment of a new president, a further review and assessment of the current organization of academic programs and departments may be warranted.

One of the questions posed in this review was whether existing governance and administrative structures provide support for student decision-making in matters related to the College as a whole, and specifically to the student experience. While the review provided evidence of successful, extensive engagement of students at many levels, the review noted that the form and nature of student participation vary substantially across the nine departments and more than 65 programs. We recommend more consistent and formal involvement of students at the academic program and department levels (e.g., program curriculum committees, program review committees, faculty search committees, etc.).
With respect to governance, the College has continually sought governance modes that provide for the effective participation of various sectors of the College community in the discussion, development, and implementation of College policies. Over the past several years, the existing cross-College governance body—the College Policy Committee—had become inactive. The Board of Trustees approved revisions to the Statutes eliminating this body. The Committee for Community and Diversity, with elected representatives from all College constituencies, has provided an interim alternative. We encourage a broad-based community review toward the goal of establishing an effective, broadly representative, cross-College governance body.

Chapter III reviewed several new initiatives launched by the Dean: the Office of Enrollment and Student Services; the Office of Teacher Education and School-based Support; the Office of Accreditation and Assessment; the Office of Policy and Research; and the Gottesman Libraries. As part of the strategic planning commitment to review and evaluate all programs, and given both the early stages of these initiatives and their common focus on improving the student experience, we recommend giving priority to the ongoing assessments of each of these initiatives.

Under the Vice President for Finance and Administration, Chapter III reviewed the substantial accomplishments in addressing the principal financial and administrative challenges that the College faced in 1997. Efforts to sustain and build on those accomplishments are ongoing. Recommendations here focus on two specific areas: physical and technology infrastructure. Through its Capital Improvement Program and its Technology Initiative, the College made dramatic improvements in these areas to improve the quality of life for its students, faculty, and staff. Continued investments in both areas, particularly as outlined in the recommendations of the Technology Planning Priorities report (Chapter II), are essential.

The Vice President for Development and External Affairs works with the Strategic Planning Implementation Team to coordinate the long-range strategic planning process for the College, which includes, among other initiatives, comprehensive modeling to study the make-up of the College, reviewing Teachers College relationship with Columbia University, and initiating the Campaign for Educational Equity to address the achievement gap in American education. The College’s successful and ongoing engagement with strategic planning was discussed at length in Chapter II. The strategic plan for Teachers College addresses every aspect of the institution’s focus, programs, operations, facilities, and finances in an ambitious but realistic and flexible way. It retains a strong focus and set of clear institutional goals while leading the entire organization along a path of innovation, investment, expansion, and renewal. Successful implementation of the strategic plan is a core recommendation throughout our self-study.

With respect to institutional development, while establishing goals and priorities for institutional development is likely to fall within a new president’s early agenda, four institutional development priorities flow from our review in this chapter: substantial additional scholarship resources; support for additional endowed professorships; resources to complete the physical renovation of the Gottesman Libraries; and, support for the outcomes of strategic planning projects (e.g., comprehensive modeling; technology priority planning).
CHAPTER IV: INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

STANDARD 6
Institutional Integrity

Introduction

This section of our self-study report provides evidence of how the College follows ethical standards, honors its agreements, and supports academic and intellectual freedom in its dealings with the external and internal constituents it serves, including: outside business dealings and financial reporting; federal and charitable donor funding; research by faculty and students; identification of conflicts of interest; management of human resources; commitment to fairness and diversity; advancement of academic and intellectual freedom; promotion of educational equity outside the institution; and, student rights and responsibilities.

The following sources were reviewed in addressing different dimensions of this standard, all of which are publicly available online or in print, including: the Donor Bill of Rights (created by the American Association of Fund Raising Counsel [AAFRC]); the Association for Healthcare Philanthropy (AHP); the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP); the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE); Policy on Interactions with Independent Contractors; Policies on interactions with the Federal Government (www.tc.edu/osp); the Teachers College Student Handbook; the Professional Staff Policy Manual; The Faculty Handbook; the College’s Statutes and Bylaws; the Diversity Mission Statement; the Annual Report 2003; the Alumni Council Bylaws and Mission Statement; and the Teachers College Catalog.

Business Dealings and Financial Reporting

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 established new standards for accountability for corporate officers and board directors, new requirements for acceptable corporate conduct, and new penalties, both civil and criminal, for transgressions. While Sarbanes-Oxley was enacted for corporations, the not-for-profit sector is under pressure to “adopt Sarbanes-Oxley.” The U.S. Senate is considering whether and how Sarbanes-Oxley should be applied to not-for-profit corporations. New York State Attorney General Eliot Spitzer was the first state law enforcement official to accept these principles and propose them as mandatory standards in the state. Many other states soon followed. Calls for greater accountability are coming from inside academia as well.

---

1 Many of these resources are available online. Copies of each of these sources will be available in the Resource Room during the site visit.
4 Ibid.
Teachers College engages in practices that embody the “spirit” of Sarbanes-Oxley, which are applicable to and consistent with academia. The following highlights the practices Teachers College has implemented, many of which are detailed later in the report:

- The President and the chief financial officer (Vice President of Finance and Administration) provide written certifications through the management representation letter attesting to the completeness and accuracy of the financial reports they validate.

The Trustees established an Audit Committee that is charged with the oversight of the College’s audit, financial, regulatory, and legal internal controls, including the quality and integrity of the College’s financial statements; the College’s compliance with legal and regulatory requirements; the independent auditors’ qualifications and independence; and, the performance of the College’s internal accounting function and independent auditors.

- The Trustees are structured in a manner to ensure independence (trustee/nominating committee), accuracy (finance, audit, and investment committees), and accountability (compensation and development committees).

- The Trustees have an annual disclosure of conflict of interest policy.

- The College adopted and implemented a conflict of interest and conflict of commitment annual disclosure policy for all faculty and staff (non-union). Annual disclosure form submissions and review are required and are a condition of employment.

- The College enacted a gift benefits policy that precludes receipt of cash (of any amount), gifts or benefits valued at more than $100. The policy requires disclosure of such as well. It excludes recognition plaques.

- The College undergoes annual audits conducted by the outside firm, KPMG Peat Marwick. The results are reported to the Audit Committee of the Trustees.

- The College has an independent contractor policy. The designation of the independent contractor status is governed by the Internal Revenue Service and common law. The College requires that a department, institute, academic program or any other unit intending to engage a service provider as an independent contractor follow College approval and contracting procedures before the performance of services. The Controller must approve the status when issues are to be reconciled.

- The College bidding policy for all purchases over $5,000 requires three bids or a single-service justification letter, attached to the purchasing requisition upon submission.

The Office of the Controller publishes online the Independent Contractors Policy which sets forth the guidelines for the procurement of independent contractors at Teachers College. The competitive quoting process fulfills the College’s social responsibility in providing an equitable process allowing qualified service providers to compete to provide services to the College.
The College has established procedures to ensure that vendors with whom the College conducts business are paid on a timely basis. These procedures require the signature of the originating department on a purchase order or invoice when it is submitted for payment. Once submitted for payment, a check will be issued to the vendor within two weeks. In some instances, internal issues such as insufficient availability of budget funds may delay payment slightly.

In order to ensure that the employees are contracting with vendors for institutional-approved expenditures, the College has a written travel and expense policy. This policy defines the nature and amount of expenditures which the College deems appropriate and will reimburse at those levels.

The College must file numerous forms with the Internal Revenue Service throughout the year. The College files an annual 990 and 990T, annual 5500s for all benefits which are offered by the College, quarterly 941s and annual W-2s, and 1099s and 1098s for employees, vendors, and students.

In order to obtain reasonable assurance that the financial statements of the College are free of material misstatement, Teachers College prepares financial statements every fiscal year in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP), which are then audited by an independent external accounting firm. Teachers College has a long-standing relationship with KPMG Peat Marwick as its external auditors. The College has always received an unqualified opinion on these statements. The financial statements are then reviewed and approved by the College’s Audit Committee, which meets twice annually to review the financial statements and the external auditors’ management letter comments, and to address all instances of internal control weaknesses or improprieties at the College. Having an external independent accounting firm review the financial statements of the College guarantees financial propriety.

Federal and Donor Funding

Charitable gifts provide a significant measure of support for Teachers College, funding a wide range of programs important to its mission. To ensure that philanthropy merits the respect and trust of the general public, and that donors and prospective donors can have full confidence in the College, the Office of Development adheres to two sets of standards: the Donor Bill of Rights and the Standards from the American Council of Gift Annuities. The Donor Bill of Rights was created by the American Association of Fund Raising Counsel (AAFRC), the Association for Healthcare Philanthropy (AHP), the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP), and the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), and it has been endorsed by numerous organizations. The American Council on Gift Annuities Council (ACGAC), a nonprofit organization whose purpose is to provide educational and other services to American charities regarding gift annuities and other forms of planned gifts, publishes a list of suggested charitable gift annuity rates for use by charities and their donors. The Council retains the services of an actuarial firm to advise and consult on matters pertaining to life expectancies and related issues. Teachers College uses the annuity rates suggested by ACGAC when establishing gift annuities.

Additionally, the strategic plan adopted by the College formalizes many of the College’s commitments to ethical behavior within the College. For instance, it requires the adoption of the
Donor Bill of Rights, which was created by the American Association of Fund Raising Counsel, the Association for Healthcare Philanthropy, the Association of Fundraising Professionals, and the Council for Advancement and Support of Education. By committing to the Donor Bill of Rights, the College ensures that the contributions of alumni and others will be ethically administered and disseminated by the College. The Donor Bill of Rights requires transparency in solicitation of contributions, and requires that alumni and others who are solicited for contributions have the “opportunity to have their names deleted from mailing lists that an organization may intend to share.”

The College’s financial records are maintained in accordance with guidelines established by the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB), specifically FASB 116 and 117. FASB guidelines mandate that the College classify funds as either operating, temporarily restricted or permanently restricted, based on the restrictions which the donor has placed on the gift. By originally classifying the College’s assets into these three categories and subsequently releasing the restrictions as appropriate expenses are incurred, the College ensures that the donor’s wishes are fulfilled.

Since Teachers College receives more than $500,000 yearly in federal funding, the College undergoes an annual A-133 audit, which is available to both its funders and collaborators upon request. The A-133 audit sets forth standards for obtaining consistency and uniformity among Federal agencies for the audit of States, local governments, and non-profit organizations expending Federal awards. The Office of Grants and Contracts Management, in conjunction with project managers, ensures that expenditures charged to federal grants are in accordance with guidelines established in OMB Circular A-21 or for private grants, in accordance with the guidelines established per the agreements.

The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), established as the core postsecondary education data collection program for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), is a system of surveys designed to collect data from all primary providers of postsecondary education. IPEDS is a single, comprehensive system designed to encompass all institutions and educational organizations whose primary purpose is to provide postsecondary education. The IPEDS system is built around a series of interrelated surveys to collect institution-level data in such areas as enrollments, program completions, faculty, staff, and finances. Teachers College is a private postsecondary school of education which receives Title IV funding. Thus, it is required by statute to complete surveys conducted as part of IPEDS pursuant to 20 U.S.C. sec 1094(a)(17)2004, and the College has done so.

Research by Faculty and Students

As a condition of receiving federal funding as detailed above, Teachers College is required to develop and enforce policies in the following research ethics areas: Human Subjects Protection, and Conflict of Interest and Research Integrity. Teachers College’s agreement with the Federal Government that allows it to conduct research involving human subjects is known as a Federal-Wide Assurance (FWA). In that agreement, Teachers College agrees to abide by the Department of Health and Human Service’s (DHHS) regulations for the protection of human research subjects, 45 CFR Part 46. Those regulations are based largely on the Belmont Report, a statement of ethical principles in human subjects protection, published in 1979. The terms of the
FWA at Teachers College apply to all research, funded or unfunded, conducted by its faculty, staff, and students, including doctoral research. The FWA also requires Teachers College to provide comprehensive, ongoing training in human subjects protection for all investigators and research staff.

The College ensures that it adheres to the ethical standards in the conduct of research involving human subjects through the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the policies and procedures it has established for the review of research protocols. These procedures are explained, and the appropriate forms are available, on the Teachers College website in order to facilitate student and faculty adherence to IRB procedures. According to IRB requirements, all Teachers College researchers, whose research involves human subjects, must receive comprehensive, ongoing training in basic human subjects protection. The College provides opportunities for such training in three ways. First, the College’s Office of Sponsored Programs offers workshops which educate researchers in ethically-appropriate research behavior. Second, the College offers an online Tutorial and Assessment through the Teachers College Portal that leads to institutional certification of training in human subjects protection. Third, the Office of Sponsored Programs provides a link (www.tc.columbia.edu/administration/osp/irb/) from its homepage to an online course which is offered through the National Cancer Institute/National Institutes of Health.

Conflict of Interest

The College Bylaws (Article I)6 address issues related to the election, removal, vacancies, and length of service of Trustees. Each Trustee is required, annually, to file a conflict of interest disclosure statement,7 which affirms that the Trustee has read and understands the Conflict of Interest Policy of Teachers College, and further confirms either the absence of any actual or potential conflict of interest involving the Trustee or any member of their family, or any Interested Equity (as defined in the Policy), or if an actual or potential conflict of interest exists, requires reporting of that interest.

Teachers College recognizes that it is in the best interests of the College community that faculty and staff have outside service, business, and professional interests. Outside interests and relationships, however, may not compromise one’s role as a member of this community and the ability to fully meet one’s College responsibilities. The purpose of the College’s policies on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment is to provide guidelines for entering into and conducting relationships with outside entities and individuals in a manner that will protect the interests of the College and the academic integrity of the instructional and research programs of the College. By action of the College’s Board of Trustees, these policies have been incorporated into the terms and conditions of employment of covered faculty and staff.

The Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment policies require each covered member of the College’s faculty and staff to annually report on outside activities and financial interests that could give rise to an actual or potential conflict of interest or commitment. The vehicle for that reporting is the “Annual Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment Disclosure Statement” which

---

6A copy of the Statutes and Bylaws are provided in the Resource Room prepared for the site visit.
7Copies of the Conflict of Interest Annual Disclosure form and the Board of Trustees Conflict of Interest Policy are available in the Resource Room.
ask covered faculty and staff to respond to a series of questions. The eight questions – for example, “Have you at any time during the past academic year and summer been engaged in, or do you anticipate during the upcoming academic year and summer being engaged in any other significant professional activities, including teaching, management or appointment to a governing or advisory body unrelated to your professional responsibilities at Teachers College?” – provide for a “No” or “Yes” response. An answer of “Yes” to any question does not in itself indicate the existence of a conflict of interest or conflict of commitment. Rather, it is an indication that an activity and its related relationships need to be fully described so that an informed decision may be made to determine whether the activity or interest creates an actual or apparent conflict. If the answer to any question is in the affirmative, a separate narrative description for each outside business or activity interest, including the nature of any ownership or other economic interests, must be completed. A form for such disclosure appears at the end of the questionnaire.

Disclosure Statements are reviewed by the respective reporting area Vice President, who determines if an actual or potential conflict of interest or conflict of commitment exists. If the determination is that a conflict does not exist, then the Statement is filed and no further action is required. If the review determines that an actual or potential conflict of interest or conflict of commitment does exist, then the faculty or professional staff member will be contacted to discuss this concern. If, after discussion, it is determined that an actual conflict of interest or conflict of commitment does exist, then the affected faculty or professional staff member is informed of the measures that are necessary to avoid, minimize or eliminate the conflict. If remedial measures are not agreed upon, then the Disclosure Statement will be reviewed by the Committee on Conflict and Commitment (CCC). The review process, which is designed to protect confidential information to the degree permitted by law, provides a final written decision which designates an activity as permissible, permissible with certain conditions or not permissible.

Faculty and professional staff are subject to the regular disciplinary process of the College if they fail to fully and truthfully disclose potential or actual conflicts of interest or commitment, or fail to comply with any stipulated plan for managing the disclosed conflict. Given that the disclosure process was implemented in order to protect the interests and integrity of all College constituencies by clarifying fair and just practices involving College resources, the ability to receive annual salary increases, to employ students, and to pursue and maintain grants will be available only to employees who have completed and returned the Disclosure Statement. All members of the Teachers College community who are required to complete the annual report on outside activities and financial interests have signed this form.

Managing Human Resources

The Professional Staff Policy Manual outlines the procedures which ensure fair and impartial practices in the hiring, evaluation, and dismissal of employees. Many sections of the Manual apply to both faculty and staff (e.g., Section #201 on affirmative action). The Manual is posted on the Office of Human Resources website. However, with respect to faculty, many

---

8The Professional Staff Policy Manual, which has been recently revised and updated to reflect changes in benefits and other policies, is available online. Access can be provided through computer terminals in the Resource Room. Copies of the Faculty Handbookaccompanied our self-study report.
distinctive mechanisms are in place to ensure treatment of the faculty which is conducive to the success of an academic institution. The procedures for faculty promotion, tenure, retention and compensation, administrative review, curricular development, and institutional governance and management are clearly documented in the Faculty Handbook. Between the Professional Staff Policy Manual and the Faculty Handbook, the College ensures that equitable and appropriately consistent treatment of constituencies occurs.

According to the Professional Staff Policy Manual (Policy #209), employees of Teachers College have the following rights: expression, professional development, problem resolution, safety, civility, freedom from violence, freedom from sexual harassment, and freedom from discrimination. In return, employees have the following responsibilities: use skills and training to perform to the best of their abilities; attempt to find better and more efficient ways of getting jobs done; be respectful; use telephone etiquette rules; comply with safety rules; and, act with honesty, integrity, and professionalism.

Integrity in Hiring Practices

The Professional Staff Policy Manual (Policy #201) outlines the policies which ensure ethical commitments in hiring employees and faculty. This section of the Professional Staff Policy Manual identifies how Teachers College complies with necessary affirmative action protocols. In addition, it requires that the College maintain an Affirmative Action Officer for all employees. The Affirmative Action/EEOC Officer for the College is the Director of Human Resources. Any discrimination complaints may be brought to the Affirmative Action/EEOC Officer.

To ensure that the College is considering a diverse candidate pool for each open position, before a search is authorized and before a new appointment can be made, the College requires completion of two affirmative action forms: Affirmative Action Recruitment Plan and Summary—Form A, and Affirmative Action Review Form—Interviewed Candidates—Form B.9 In addition to requiring a summary of the job description, Form A requires a careful delineation of the selection criteria that will be used to identify candidates for interview as well as the recruitment procedures that will be followed to assure a diverse applicant pool. Form A also provides for reporting the race, ethnicity and gender of applicants. Form B requires documenting specific information on each candidate interviewed and the candidate selected for the position.

The College also uses a number of recruiting sources to guarantee that open positions are widely disseminated, thereby ensuring equal visibility to all potential candidates and to equal opportunity in employment. The Office of Human Resources lists job openings with appropriate agencies and publications, such as higheredjobs.com. All job postings include grade and salary range and are displayed on a bulletin board in Main Hall and online for at least five working days.

Teachers College follows strict procedures to honor its agreements with staff members. In order to properly define and classify all positions, supervisors are responsible for informing the Human Resources department of any changes in the job of staff members so as to maintain equitability and to support any relevant salary changes. “A job description shall be drafted and

9Copies of both forms will be available in the Resource Room, along with other Affirmative Action documents, during the site visit.
approved by the supervisor for newly created or existing positions and forwarded to Human Resources for evaluation” (Professional Staff Policy Manual, Policy #203).

Once a job description has been approved by Human Resources, the position is assigned a grade, based on the complexity of the work being performed and level of supervision. All staff members are paid within the range established for the position grade. Staff members are also provided with benefits. Those mandated by law include Social Security contributions and Worker’s Compensation. In addition, professional and instructional staff members are provided with the following benefits: health insurance, dental insurance, vision insurance, life insurance, TIAA Long-Term Disability Insurance, COBRA, and Employee Tuition Exemption. Staff who are members of collective bargaining units have similar benefits, though their retirement program is a defined benefit plan (as distinct from the defined contribution plan offered to non-union, full-time employees through TIAA/CREF).

All applicable payroll taxes (including FICA) and garnishments are withheld from employee payroll checks, and these funds as well as the College’s contributions are submitted within the guidelines established by each of the regulatory agencies.

**Promotion and Tenure**

Impartiality and fairness in reviewing faculty for promotion and tenure are addressed by the College’s multi-layered process. Each year, all pre-tenured tenure-track faculty undertake a formal review with the Chair of their academic department, with consultation from the program coordinator of the individual’s program. They review the individual’s scholarship, teaching, and service for the year, and discuss recommendations regarding future activity in these areas. These annual meetings are important occasions both for highlighting accomplishments and articulating areas of concern. Then, each pre-tenured professor undertakes a formal “Third-Year Review,” a condition for reappointment to a second three-year term (candidates come up for tenure and promotion typically in their sixth year). The Third-Year Review involves the individual professor assembling a dossier that contains a professional statement of accomplishments and future plans, an up-to-date curriculum vitae, selected publications, course evaluations, letters from student advisees and students in courses (solicited by the department, not the individual professor), and other pertinent materials. All tenured faculty in the department review this dossier and convene a formal review meeting, at the conclusion of which the tenured faculty vote for or against a recommendation for reappointment.

The Department Chair then forwards the candidate’s dossier and recommendation (with a report of the meeting, including a summary of the principal substantive points made and numerical result of vote taken) together with his or her independent recommendation to the Dean. Prior to making an independent recommendation to the President, the Dean convenes a meeting with the candidate, the department chair, and the Associate Dean for Academic Administration to discuss the dossier and share information that would be relevant to the reappointment decision. The ultimate responsibility for making recommendations to the Board of Trustees in this matter rests with the President. The President may, after considering the

---

10 A more extended discussion of the College’s promotion and tenure review policies and procedures provided under Standard 10 (Chapter VII). Relevant personnel policy and procedure documents are available in the Faculty Handbook.
Dean’s recommendation, accept it, question it, return it for additional review or reject it. If the president rejects the Dean’s recommendation, he or she informs the Dean and the appropriate Department Chair of the reasons for the action.

Consideration for tenure moves the individual professor to another fully transparent layer of assessment. In addition to the materials described above, the individual also submits to the Department Chair a list of highly-regarded scholars from around the world in his/her field of study, as well as a list of colleagues from the College who can evaluate his/her work. Simultaneously, the program coordinator submits to the Department Chair a list of potential external and internal reviewers who can evaluate the candidate’s work. The Chair selects a final group of eight external and four internal reviewers. Tenured faculty in the department convene a review meeting, at the conclusion of which they vote to make a recommendation to the Dean regarding appointment to tenure. Reviews for promotion to full professor follow a similar pattern, with the exception that the department review is limited to the tenured, full professors of the department.

The next layer involves the Standing Committee on Appointment to Tenure or the Standing Committee on Promotion to Full Professor, depending on the nature of the review under consideration. Each of the Standing Committees has elected and appointed faculty representatives, and an additional faculty representative appointed on an ad hoc basis who has expertise related to the candidate. The Standing Committees are both chaired by the Dean. The President may attend ex officio. At a minimum, in preparation for its review, the Committee is provided with an extensive set of materials that includes: recommendations of the Department Chair and the department; written observations of teaching; candidate’s Curriculum Vitae and statement of professional plans; evaluation letters from the field and from Teachers College Faculty; course syllabi, responses to student surveys about teaching and advising, and summaries of student course evaluations; and the set of publications that were sent to external reviewers.

All materials included in the candidate’s dossier are available for examination prior to each review. The Standing Committee reviews the entire dossier, meets as a Committee to review and discuss the dossier, and then votes to make a recommendation to the Dean on tenure or promotion. As with the vote by the academic department, the vote of the Standing Committee is recommendatory rather than determinative.

The next two layers of review involve the Dean, who makes an independent assessment and recommendation to the President, and the President, who has the responsibility under College Statutes to recommend candidates for appointment to tenure to the Teachers College Board of Trustees. Prior to being submitted to the Trustees, nomination of candidates for tenure are subject to the approval of the President of Columbia University.

As noted, the processes for promotion in rank from Associate to Full Professor are substantially identical, with the exception that the Standing Committee on Promotion to Full Professor undertakes the responsibility for the College-wide review. While the Standing Committee on Appointment to Tenure is comprised of faculty who have tenure and hold the rank of either Associate or Full Professor, the Promotion Committee is comprised solely of faculty with tenure who hold the rank of Full Professor.
All external and internal review letters are solicited and held in confidence from both candidates and all others, save those called to render an assessment; thus, letter writers can speak frankly from their positions of expertise and knowledge.

All of these procedures are described in detail in the Personnel Document that candidates for tenure and/or promotion receive. The entire process is spelled out, including a specific calendar of dates for when to prepare materials, when review meetings will take place, and so forth. All criteria of review are discussed in a detailed, comprehensive manner.

Moreover, the College periodically undertakes a formal review of its assessment mechanisms, the results of which are shared with faculty and which from time to time supplant previous mechanisms. The Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) Subcommittee on Academic Personnel is the faculty governance unit that is charged with, among other things, the responsibility for working collaboratively with the administration to review and recommend revisions to academic personnel policies and procedures.

**Discipline and Dismissal**

When the position of a full-time professional staff member with at least one year of full-time continuous employment is eliminated because of budgetary constraints, reorganization or other reason (such as shortage of work and/or stop work orders), College policy requires that the professional employee be notified as soon as possible, with a minimum notice of one month. If possible, the College will attempt to place the employee in another vacant position for which that person is qualified. Severance pay will be calculated on a basis of one week for each 12 months. Employees with at least three years of service to the College will be offered continuation of health, dental, vision, and life insurance for up to four months after the last day of employment.

With regard to discipline, when employees fail to meet Teachers College standards, the following procedures apply. The supervisor and staff member will first create a timetable and written report of the steps taken toward attaining the standards and a copy of this will be placed in the Human Resources file. At the end of the timetable, a discussion between the supervisor and staff member will occur to discuss whether the standards were satisfied, and a memo recording the meeting will be kept in the Human Resources file. If the minimum standards were not met, a notice of suspension or termination is given with one month’s notice. In cases of dishonesty, disruptive activity or other serious infraction, termination may be immediate, with no notice period.

**Grievances**

The Staff Policy Manual (Policy #205) outlines the procedures in place which respond to grievances. If a grievance is not resolved after the problem has been brought to the attention of the appropriate supervisor, then the matter is brought to the attention of the appropriate department head. The department head must arrange a meeting within 15 days upon receiving notification about the problem. If the problem has not been resolved with the supervisor or the department head, then the issue is dealt with by the Director of Human Resources, who organizes and facilitates a joint meeting with the staff member, the department head, and the supervisor. If the problem is still unresolved at this point, the staff member can submit a written description of the problem to the Vice President for Finance and Administration or to the Dean, as appropriate. If the
matters remains unresolved, an ad hoc committee of professional staff will attempt to resolve the problem. If the matter is not successfully resolved at that stage, the staff member may approach the Faculty Advisory Committee, which is empowered to review the matter and make a recommendation to the President. If the recommendation is accepted by the President, this action shall be considered final. If not, the President is required to forward the recommendation of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Trustees with the President’s reasons for rejection and a proposal for resolving the difficulty. Action by the Trustees will be final. The stages of this procedure for resolving the problems of staff members ensure equitable and appropriately-consistent treatment of staff. In addition, a procedure to handle requests of faculty and staff for legal assistance involving College concerns is outlined on the Human Resources page of the Teachers College website.

Faculty grievance procedures are described in the Statutes of the College. The Faculty Advisory Committee is the body charged with the responsibility to hear faculty personnel grievances.

Unions

With respect to unionized staff, Teachers College ensures ethical treatment of union employees and honors the agreements made with the unions. The College recognizes three unions on its campus: the Highway Local Motor Freight Drivers, Dockmen, and Helpers Local Union No. 707; the Technical Office and Professional Union Local Union No. 2110; and the Service Employees International Union 32B-32J.

Collective bargaining agreements with the unions who represent certain of the College’s employees stipulate the hiring policy for union positions and the use of seniority in awarding these positions; a grievance process by which these employees can effectuate change in all aspects of their working environment; and a disciplinary process, where failure to meet job expectations can be clearly identified and addressed. The interactions between the College and the unions are governed by a federal law known as the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). In accordance with the NLRA, the union and the College are obligated to bargain over wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, and that bargaining must be done in “good faith.” The duty to bargain in good faith has been defined as an “obligation to participate actively in the deliberations so as to indicate a present intention to find a basis for agreement.” The good faith bargaining obligation informs all of the College’s interactions with the unions representing College employees. Perhaps the best way to describe it is as follows: when the College meets with one of the unions to negotiate over wages, hours, and terms and conditions of employment, the College does so with an open mind and with a sincere desire to reach an agreement. Of course, an agreement cannot always be reached, but the College enters all of its negotiations intent on making an effort to reach a common ground with the union.

Professional Development Initiative

The Strategic Plan states that the College has to “make meaningful, consistent investments in the skills and capabilities of everyone employed at the College” (Strategy 1.3.3.). At present, the College meets this responsibility toward its employees in several ways. For example, the College honors its employment agreement by establishing a job description for all
positions which clearly states the College’s expectations of employees. Salary and benefits are defined accordingly. Also, the Office of Human Resources assesses interests and needs for additional skills and capabilities in all areas of the College, prioritizes those needs, and identifies available programs to serve the assessed needs in a cost-effective manner.

Essential to supporting the development of the skills and capabilities of everyone employed at the College, the College also ensures ethical standards in its dealings internally by establishing guidelines of acceptable behavior within the College community and then providing effective remedies for individuals who have been harassed or discriminated against because these standards of appropriate behavior have not been followed.

The College has recently committed to an institution-wide professional development initiative designed to strengthen the College’s integrity in its internal processes and to enhance the community. The initiative is a partnership between the Office of Diversity and Community and the Office of Human Resources. Its goals are to ensure the College’s continued legal compliance, to encourage professional and personal growth, to change campus culture, to strengthen relationships within the community, and to meet the strategic planning charge to make meaningful, consistent investments in the skills and capabilities of everyone employed at the College.

A Professional Development Committee (PDC) was established to spearhead this endeavor. The PDC is comprised of representatives from faculty, professional and union staff, senior administration and students. As part of this initiative, a professional development and programming coordinator was hired in January, 2006 (housed in the Office of Diversity and Community) and a training manager will be hired in Fall, 2006 (to be housed in the Office of Human Resources).

Tailored professional development programs for employees will address regulatory and legal compliance requirements; diversity and community issues; faculty and staff orientations; and, systematic dissemination and education around College policies. As a first priority, the PDC has proposed instituting an on-going program of seminars that would focus on core issues of ethical and appropriate behavior (e.g., harassment). The seminar program, which seeks to complement and extend current orientation and dissemination efforts, would be mandatory and would more successfully ensure that these core issues are continually discussed in our community and remain in the forefront.

Commitment to Fairness and Diversity

The College’s commitment to an ethical community which is intellectually and culturally diverse is documented in its Diversity Mission Statement, amended and approved by the Faculty on October 17, 2002:

To establish Teachers College as an institution that actively attracts, supports, and retains diverse students, faculty, and staff at all levels, demonstrated through its commitment to social justice, its respectful and vibrant community, and its encouragement and support of each individual in the achievement of his or her full potential.
The adoption and implementation of the Diversity Mission Statement have been positive catalysts in creating a climate that fosters respect for a range of backgrounds, ideas, and perspectives among students, faculty, staff, and administration.

Furthermore, the College follows a strict nondiscrimination policy that is in accordance with the Revenue Procedure 75-50 of December 8, 1975, Title IX of Education Amendments of 1972, and Part 86 of the Health and Human Services Regulations:

*Continuing its long-standing policy to support actively equality for all persons, Teachers College does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, creed, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, ancestry, age, marital status, citizenship status, veteran status, disability or any other criterion specified by federal, state or local laws, in the administration of its admission, employment and educational policies or scholarship, loan, athletic and other school-administered programs. Rather, Teachers College affirms that it admits students and selects employees regardless of their race, color, religion, creed, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, ancestry, age, marital status, citizenship status, veteran status, disability or any other criterion specified by federal, state or local laws and thereafter accords them all the rights and privileges generally made available to students or employees at the school. (Faculty Handbook, 2004-2005, Section 6, p. 3)*

The last formal institutional assessment of campus climate was conducted in 1999, culminating in the Diversity Taskforce Report. Following this report’s recommendation, President Arthur Levine created the Office of Diversity and Community (ODC), and appointed an attorney/educator as its head. The ODC is part of the Office of the President, and Director heading it sits on the President’s Senior Staff. In collaboration with others at the College, the ODC works to serve students, faculty, and professional and union staff in an effort to assure that all members of the Teachers College community are welcomed, accepted, valued, affirmed, appreciated, and treated fairly. Efforts are aimed primarily at creating opportunities to build healthy working relationships; to enhance the academic, work, and cultural life of the College; and to address complex legal issues.

The Office for Diversity and Community leads the President’s and College’s initiatives concerning community, diversity, civility, equity, and discrimination. The Office, under the direction of Janice Robinson, who also serves as General Counsel, addresses issues from faculty, staff, students, and alumni. These concerns may overlap with potential legal issues (i.e., equity, discrimination, due process, retaliation). The philosophy of ODC is to encourage the College community to listen, learn, educate, and work together in positive ways. At the same time, the Office focuses on systemic issues by addressing policy and procedural concerns.

The most recent evidence of Teachers College’s history of commitment to actively attract, support, educate, and retain diverse students, faculty, and staff at all levels within the institution are reflected, among many other ways, through its faculty and student demographics, as follows:

With respect to matriculated students at Teachers College during the Fall, 2005, term:
Students from Fall, 2005, came to Teachers College from all 50 U.S. states and 80 countries.

The College currently employs 747 individuals in full- and part-time professional staff and union positions. Excluding those individuals for whom for data are not currently available, the table below shows the current distribution of professional staff and union employees by gender and race/ethnicity.

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional and Union Staff</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino(a)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the professional and union staff at the College are quite diverse. The table below disaggregates the data by employment category, and provides gender and race/ethnicity information for the union staff and the professional staff, respectively.

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union Staff</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino(a)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

11Gender and race/ethnicity data for professional and union staff for the past several years, with distributions by full- and part-time employment status, are available in the Resource Room.
Table 4.3 (con’t.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino(a)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below provides faculty demographics. The character and composition of the faculty are discussed in more detail in Chapter VII (Standard 10).

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Demographics as of December 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino(a) Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino(a) Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers College has been proactive in protecting its students, faculty, and staff from sexual discrimination. The Harassment Panel, which consists of faculty, student, and staff representatives of the College community, is appointed by the President of Teachers College. It serves as the primary vehicle through which the College addresses concerns related to harassment involving race, color, religion, creed, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, ancestry, age, marital status, citizenship status, veteran status, disability or any other criterion specified by federal, state or local laws. According to the College’s defined protocol, formal complaints of harassment should be directed to the Dean, the appropriate Vice President or the Director of Human Resources. The policies also provide for informal complaint resolution options. Complaints or reports will be treated with appropriate sensitivity and, whenever possible, confidentiality.
Lastly, Teachers College strives to be responsive on both the letter and spirit of the Americans with Disabilities Act and other similar legislation. The College has developed a professionally-staffed office to achieve this goal. Programs and services for individuals with disabilities have been developed to ensure that higher education environments at Teachers College are physically, programmatically, and attitudinally accessible. The aim of the Office of Access and Services for Individuals with Disabilities (OASID) is to ensure equal access through the provision of a wide range of individualized services for persons with varying disabilities. As of Fall, 2004, Teachers College had enrolled close to 400 students with varying disabilities, including learning disabilities, mobility impairment, visual and/or auditory impairments, and other health impairments. Teachers College submits the Enrollment of College Students with Disabilities Survey (Form NYSED-2H-2) to the New York State Education Department each year.

Supporting Academic and Intellectual Freedom

As stated in the College Catalog, Teachers College insists on the greatest degree of freedom in inquiry, teaching, learning, and expression for all of its members. The exercise of these rights, however, must not violate the free exercise of the same rights by other members of the community.

The Statutes of Teachers College, Section VI.B.2, stipulate that faculty must have full academic freedom to research and publish the results of their research. Additionally, all faculty members have full academic freedom in classroom discussions relating to the subject being taught. If conflicts should arise, a standing Faculty Advisory Committee, which is composed of faculty members of various ranks, is empowered to work with the President and Dean of the College to resolve such conflicts.

An essential element for a climate of academic inquiry and engagement is to ensure a significant degree of faculty control over the functioning of their institution. The College’s Faculty Executive Committee has several subcommittees, namely, the Subcommittee on the Academic Program; the Subcommittee on Personnel; the Subcommittee on Finance, Facilities, and Support Services; and the Subcommittee on Race, Culture, and Diversity. Since the College’s Faculty members are actively involved in designing academic programs, addressing personnel issues, and bringing questions of diversity to the forefront of academic discussions by means of the Faculty Executive Committee, a climate of academic inquiry and engagement is possible. Furthermore, the New York State Education Department (NYSED) has numerous requirements and regulations pertaining to the degrees offered at Teachers College; it has complied with all of these requirements and regulations. The most recent NYSED review of programs at Teachers College focused on the re-registration and approval of all teacher preparation and school leadership programs leading to institutional recommendations for NYSED certification.

Full-time professional staff hired on or after January 1, 2004, and unionized staff hired on or after September 1, 2004, are eligible to receive tuition exemption of up to 12 credits per fiscal year at Teachers College or 9 credits per year at Columbia University if enrolled in a degree-granting program.

12The Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) and Subcommittees are discussed in more detail in Chapter III.
The College’s alumni are represented in the affairs of the College through the Alumni Council, which consists of a board of 35 members of the Alumni Association. Nominated members of the Alumni Association who are elected to the Alumni Council serve three-year terms. Under the purview of the Alumni Council (Article III.B of the Alumni Council Bylaws) is a mission to provide both alumni and members of the Teachers College community with opportunities to explore issues regarding academic programs at the College. Such opportunities would allow for alumni to be informed about issues of academic freedom which may arise, as well as give alumni the occasion to voice their concerns with representatives of the College.

The College also encourages and supports the free discussion of varying opinions on major issues. For example, guest speakers and lecturers are regularly invited to the campus to present their views on a wide range of topics. Here are some examples:

- *Brown vs. the Board of Education*;
- Privatization of schools;
- Gay/lesbian educational and legal issues;
- Forum on religious education during times of war;
- Liberia: Past and present political/legal climate;
- Deaf awareness—Educational and legal issues; and
- Overcoming racism.

Teachers College has a clear institutional commitment to principles of protecting intellectual property rights. This commitment is evidenced in the Policy on Intellectual Property Rights (adopted January 2002), which is published in the Faculty Handbook. The Policy on Intellectual Property Rights “governs covered intellectual property created in part or in whole by faculty, students, and staff of Teachers College in situations in which the parties have not entered into a written agreement concerning the ownership of intellectual property that has or will be created and the apportionment of revenues and other rights that may be derived from such intellectual property.” In situations where the College retains the rights to intellectual property, the policy contains the procedure for the proper distribution of revenues which result from the intellectual property (Section II.F).

**Promoting Educational Equity outside the Institution**

First and foremost, Teachers College is committed to educational equity. Described at length in earlier sections of this self-study report, it is important to note here as well that the College’s commitment to educational equity is embedded in the mission recently adopted by the Board of Trustees:

Teachers College is dedicated to promoting equity and excellence in education and overcoming the gap in educational access and achievement between the most and least advantaged groups in society. Through programs of teaching, research, and service, the College draws upon the expertise of a diverse community of
faculty in education, psychology, and health, as well as students and staff from across the country and around the world.

President Levine, in unveiling the Campaign for Educational Equity, spoke to the heart of the College’s mission:

At TC, we view educational equity as the greatest challenge facing education today and a powerful threat to our country. It is a moral threat: In an age when good jobs require higher levels of skills and knowledge than ever before in history, children are denied the education to acquire them, simply because of their parents’ skin color or income. It is also a social threat: Inadequately educated children are more likely to be arrested, become pregnant, use drugs, experience violence and require public assistance.... The TC community has embraced the issue of educational equity because, first and foremost, this has been at the heart of what we do.... I explain that TC’s mission and purpose is best described with two Hebrew words: Tikkum Olam—to repair the world.

As a dimension of the College’s efforts to promote educational equity, the Office of External Affairs is committed to providing the media with truthful, accurate information about the College and the work of its faculty and staff, while at the same time ensuring that Teachers College receives the recognition it deserves as a national and international education resource and leader. The Office of External Affairs holds itself to the same standard in its internal communications to faculty, staff, and students while seeking to facilitate interchange and awareness among the many departments, centers, and outreach efforts that exist within Teachers College.

The media have a profound impact on local, state, and national policy issues. In large measure, they shape how education is viewed by government, business, the philanthropic community, parents, and the general public. Those who cover education and those who supervise the coverage of education are responsible for ensuring that events are placed into context and that history is acknowledged. As institutions, schools are not islands unto themselves. They exist within social, economic, racial, and political milieus that exert a profound influence on what happens in classrooms. This must be reflected in the media coverage if it is to promote understanding and, when necessary, action by parents and communities, in order to improve educational quality. To assist the media in this important task, Teachers College launched a program in 1996 for professional journalists, named in memory of Fred M. Hechinger, a former education editor of The New York Times and a trustee of Teachers College. The Hechinger Institute is dedicated to fair, accurate, and insightful reporting on education by print and broadcast journalists.

Teachers College has several educational programs whose target population is the community around the College. For example, Replications, Inc. is the result of a new collaboration between Teachers College and several New York City public schools. The program’s mission is to replicate proven successful public schools by transmitting their cultures to new schools. The Teachers College Urban Science Center collaborates with the Harlem Middle School for Mathematics and Science. This Center aims to open new opportunities for the mostly African-American and Latino students attending this middle school to enjoy this important subject. Another community initiative, the Heritage School, is set in a landmark
building on Lexington Avenue in East Harlem. The school is a partnership between Teachers College and the New York City Board of Education, and has as its mandate education in the arts and culture at the core of the curriculum.

**Student Rights and Responsibilities**

Admissions to Teachers College is made without discrimination based on race, color, religious creed, sex, sexual orientation or national origin (Non-Discrimination Policy, page 68 of the Student Handbook). The Statutes of the College further provide that “The admission of a student, their continuance upon the rolls of the College, the receipt by them of academic credit for work completed, graduation, and the conferring of any degree or diploma upon them shall be subject strictly to the control of the College, which shall be free to refuse or cancel registration at any time on any grounds, except those cited above, which it deems desirable” (Statutes, VII-C). While the College has the authority for actions in the areas noted above, the exercise of that authority is generally subject to the grievance procedures in instances in which a student believes that the policies guiding such authority have been applied in a capricious or discriminatory fashion.

The College recognizes five fundamental rights and freedoms of a student: (1) to express individual opinion; (2) to assemble; (3) to organize in a student council that is representative of the entire student body; (4) to petition; and (5) to be heard on issues involving student interests. Furthermore, the College has developed a set of procedural guidelines and process that recognizes, respects, and protects these rights (these procedural guidelines are outlined in the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students, copies of which are available in the Office of Enrollment and Student Services).

To ensure that Teachers College students have an opportunity to voice concerns and discuss any problems or challenges they are facing, three major communication mechanisms have been put in to effect, beginning with academic year 2004-05, in the newly created Office of Enrollment and Student Services (OESS):

- **Student Intake process:** Students may walk into the OESS main office suite at any time and request an individual appointment to discuss any issue. If the matter they wish to discuss is of an emergency nature, it is addressed immediately. Confidential records are kept of every student interaction, the nature of the matter addressed, and how it was resolved.

- **Open Office Hours:** Twice per semester, the Associate Dean in the OESS holds open office hours, during which time students may come and speak directly with him about any issue. During the 2004-05 academic year, some 100 students took advantage of this opportunity to let their opinions/concerns/suggestions be known.

- **Town Meetings:** Once per semester, the Associate Dean holds a town meeting, which is open to all students. After some opening remarks, the floor is open to students to ask questions and engage in dialogue with the Associate Dean. Other representatives of the OESS are present at the meeting to assist in discussing and answering questions. The Associate Dean sends a report to all students on what was discussed at the meeting, and what steps are being taken to address the issues raised.
Diversity is a prominent tenet of the College mission. The College strives to be a diverse and multicultural graduate institution. Minority and urban issues remain an a core component of the College’s commitment to the support and recruitment of students; however, the College will maintain a visible stance on equality of opportunity for all persons. The Office of Diversity and Community, housed in the President’s Office, works to ensure that all students at Teachers College are welcomed, appreciated, accepted, celebrated, heard, and treated fairly and in non-discriminatory ways. The Office also sponsors an annual “Conversation with the President” and a “Conversation with the Dean”, as well as dinner gatherings with students, to foster an informal exchange of information, concerns, questions, and suggestions.

Under the auspices of the Office of Access and Services for Individuals with Disabilities (OASID), access and services to the College include recognition of students with special needs. Efforts have been made to remove physical barriers to facilitate easier access into and around the College; to increase enrollment of students with special needs; and to acknowledge and celebrate this specific act of diversity as part of the mission of the College. Overall, these issues are incorporated into the intellectual and social fabric of the College.

The College regularly asks for student feedback on their experience at Teachers College. Among these initiatives are the following:

- The Office of Institutional Studies (OIS) conducts annual student surveys asking questions about academic programs, advisement, and experiences in the classroom. The results of these surveys are made known to the Dean, faculty, students, and the appropriate offices being reviewed.

- The Office of Enrollment and Student Services (OESS) has initiated an incoming student survey, sent to all newly-enrolled students each Fall and asking for feedback on new student orientation as well as perceptions of customer service in each department in the OESS. The first OESS incoming student survey was sent out in the Fall of 2004. Of 1,343 surveyed, 720 responded. The Office of Institutional Studies assisted with the preparation of the survey findings. As a result, the Teachers College Orientation Program was expanded from one day to five days, and an in-depth review was initiated for each department in OESS. This review consisted of updating all job descriptions and reviewing all office procedures. This review process is still going on in OESS.

- OESS also conducts a survey each Spring semester on a topic of interest for students. In the Spring of 2005, the survey was sent to all doctoral students, asking for their feedback on four areas: fairness of awarding scholarships, academic advising, the Institutional Review Board process, and customer service in the Office of Doctoral Studies. Of 1,800 doctoral students surveyed, just under 700 completed the survey. Results were shared with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and also with the ODS staff. Customer service initiatives have been put in place as a result of the feedback received from the survey. In the Spring of 2005, another survey will be conducted, with the topic yet to be determined.
In an effort to better understand the impact of Teachers College on its graduates, the College is conducting a survey of alumni who graduated in 2004, 2002, 2000 and 1995. It are asking these graduates to describe how their Teachers College education helped them in their current profession, and also, if they felt that their time at the College was instrumental in helping to develop their leadership skills. Data are being analyzed, and a report will be ready in late Spring of 2006. This project was made possible with a grant from the Morton Mandel Foundation.

Honoring Agreements with the Students

While Teachers College does not operate on the basis of detailed regulations and processes with respect to its code of conduct, it does expect that all members of the College community—faculty, students, and staff—observe traditional canons of scholarly discourse, academic behavior, and due process. All members of the College community are expected to exhibit the high level of personal integrity which society demands of professionals.

Student input on important issues will be assured in a number of other ways, including Town Meetings with the President of the College. These forums will provide an open and accessible vehicle for communication about important College issues and developments, and will afford students the opportunity to raise issues of importance to them or the community. It is the goal of the College to provide students with opportunities for effective input with respect to the evaluation of teaching, both College-wide and departmentally.

The College will emphasize the highest levels of freedom of inquiry, teaching, learning, and expression of all its members. Additionally, individuals may express these rights as long as doing so does not infringe on the rights of other members of the College community. As such, members of both the Teachers College and Columbia University communities will not be exposed to activities from other members that interfere with the regular and essential operations of the school, or with the freedom of ideas or movement within the College or University.

In addition, the College will ensure that all member organizations comply with national, state, and local laws regarding their conduct within the community. Students will be presented with an atmosphere free of actions or situations that endanger mental or physical health as well as forced consumption of liquor or drugs for the purposes of initiation into or affiliation with any organization.

All members of the College or University community have recourse against violations of these standards. Charges may be filed with the Office of the Associate Dean for Enrollment and Student Affairs. The College ensures that appropriate disciplinary action—including, but not limited to disciplinary probation, suspension, or expulsion—will be taken against those members who violate the standards.

The Ombudsman for students is charged with attempting to resolve informally a student’s dissatisfactions about their academic programs, financial aid, housing or other related matters. All consultations with the Ombudsman are completely confidential.

Supporting Academic and Intellectual Freedom with Students
Teachers College will honor its commitments and dedication to creating an academic community which attracts, welcomes, and facilitates the full participation of a broad spectrum of individuals and groups in the life of the College community. The College will insist on the greatest degree of freedom of inquiry, teaching, learning, and expression for all its members.

The College will ensure that its students are exposed to the mission activities within educational discourse. This includes research on critical issues facing education; preparation of the next generation of leaders for education; education of the current generation of leaders in policy and practice; development of public discourse and policy in education; and improvement of practice in educational institutions.

Students will have access to increased academic freedom via electronic communities and portals to enhance the academic experience for the College’s students. This includes access to academic portals, Class Web, listservs, electronic enrollment information, and expanded electronic literature. Additionally, students will have the freedom to expand academic communities through various departmental publications or journals.

Students may register charges of violations of standards of academic and intellectual freedom with the Office of the Associate Dean for Academic Administration.

Recommendations

The reviews undertaken to address Standard 6, *Institutional Integrity*, affirmed that the College is actively and deeply dedicated to honoring its agreements with those with whom it associates. Nonetheless, in the course of this self-study, there were five specific areas recognized as requiring further review and possible action. Recommendations in each of these areas are offered below.

As detailed in a number of sections of our self-study report, in Fall, 2005, the College introduced its Campaign for Educational Equity (CEE). This provides the College with a unique opportunity to offer leadership nationally and internationally in continuing to work toward educational access for all. In affirming the importance of the CEE, our review also underscored the importance of creating mechanisms to assure that members of the College community remain actively engaged in the campaign at all levels. More specifically, we recommend the creation of an internal task force, complementing other advisory groups that have been established for the Campaign for Educational Equity, consisting of members of the Teachers College community, and charged with the responsibility to work closely with the campaign’s leadership, to assure that the focus of this effort includes the perspectives of those most involved in helping realize its full potential.

While the College takes several steps to ensure ethical standards in its dealings internally by establishing guidelines of acceptable behavior in the community, and then providing remedies for individuals who have been harassed or discriminated against because such behavior has not been followed; and, further, while these standards are disseminated at hire date and are available on the web, our review underscored both the importance of and the need for the development and implementation of a more comprehensive program of staff development and training, including
consideration of mandatory annual attendance, to ensure that important issues (e.g., sexual harassment, racial bias, etc.) are continually addressed in the College community.

In a similar vein, our review also recommends the creation of a comprehensive program in support of staff development. The College has been effective in establishing job descriptions for all positions which clearly state the College’s expectations of employees. Building on that, we believe that the College can do more by providing additional training of individuals to develop them in their current positions (addressing regulatory requirements and best practices to facilitate meeting expectations) and to grow professionally. The professional development initiative outlined here is essential to meeting the strategic planning charge to make meaningful, consistent investments in the skills and capabilities of everyone employed at the College.

As a core component of professional development and growth, we recommend that performance reviews be conducted uniformly and consistently throughout the College. At present, annual reviews are conducted in a random fashion, with some employees receiving no annual review at all. We believe the College needs to be fair and equitable in ensuring that all employees receive performance feedback in an systematic and regular manner, and we recommend a review and overhaul of the existing performance appraisal system as a first, foundational step.

Lastly, while the protection of student rights have been clearly stated in College documents, policies and procedures have not always been made transparent to the student body. Complementing recommendations developed in Chapter VI (Standards 8 and 9), we also recommend systematic attention to all policies and procedures that apply to student life at the College toward the goal of assuring both fair and equitable policies and procedures and the effective, transparent communication of those policies and procedures to all students.
CHAPTER V: INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

STANDARD 7
Institutional Assessment

Introduction

This chapter of our self-study report addresses Standard 7, Institutional Assessment. It describes the College’s processes and practices developed to evaluate its effectiveness in achieving its mission, goals, and objectives, as formulated in the strategic plan and other documents; implementing planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal processes; using institutional resources efficiently; providing leadership and governance; providing administrative structures and services; and demonstrating institutional integrity. Assessment practices with respect to learning and other outcomes for students and graduates are addressed in Chapter VIII.

In addition to providing overviews of each of these areas, the report also addresses the following subgroup charges:

- How is the College currently assessing the achievement of its mission and goals?
- How is the College currently assessing the success of its academic and extra-curricular offerings?
- Do the assessments collected in connection with other Standards provide a comprehensive response to the issues stipulated in Standard 7?

As is evidenced in the narrative below, all assessment and evaluation processes and practices at the College:

- are collaborative, involving a number of constituencies (i.e., faculty, students, staff, administration, Trustees, and outside partners, as appropriate) at all stages, from the development of evaluative studies to the review of the results;
- use multiple qualitative and quantitative measures, a variety of data-gathering mechanisms, and a variety of internal and external sources; and,
- yield results that are useful in institutional planning, resource allocation, and renewal, both at individual department/office and College-wide levels.

Achieving Mission, Goals, and Objectives

As described in Chapter II, the College’s mission and goals are articulated in the strategic plan, which was developed with the broadest participation of all stakeholders. When the strategic planning process was initiated, a broad range of fact-finding and data-gathering techniques were employed to collect information. Individuals within and outside of the College were interviewed, and numerous faculty and staff were consulted, both individually and in work group formats. Key data describing the current and historical operation of Teachers College were assembled by members of the Strategic Planning Committee and further analyzed by the evaluation consultant. Previous planning efforts for the College were also examined and their
findings were incorporated where relevant. Faculty, staff, and Trustees were provided with a written survey instrument, through which they were invited to express their opinions and make suggestions to the committee.¹

The strategic plan provides a framework for evaluation processes and practices. It formulates a cohesive model of goals and specific objectives/strategies, each with corresponding measures of success.² The plan calls for ongoing monitoring of the progress toward achieving the described objectives and developing recommendations for the further implementation, modification, and revision of broad goals and specific objectives. The Strategic Planning Implementation Committee³ is responsible for monitoring the College’s progress in implementing the stated objectives and reporting to the community (updates are available online at http://www.tc.edu/strategic%2Dplanning/). A brief summary of the College’s progress on each of the 21 initiatives comprising the strategic plan was provided in Chapter II.

Implementing Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal Processes

Institutional renewal is based on short- and long-term objectives, as identified in the strategic plan. These objectives were developed based on the information collected from the sources outside and inside the College. The results of an environmental scan were summarized into five groups of challenges that the College’s strategic plan intended to address (discussed at more length in Chapter II).

In the process of implementing its strategic goals, the College continues to systematically collect and thoroughly analyze a wide array of quantitative and qualitative data. We are currently engaged in a Comprehensive Modeling exercise to study the make-up of the College. The modeling takes into account more than a dozen variables, such as composition of student population (master’s and doctoral students), student-faculty ratio, faculty workload, financial aid, and so on. The change in one variable creates changes in the others—all feeding to a bottom line of increased or decreased net revenue. The modeling allows the College to examine critical long-range issues (such as long-range budgeting and tuition dependency) surrounding the make-up and long-term financial security of the College. In the second phase of the modeling exercise, the College will choose the optimum mix (Master’s vs. doctoral students, full- vs. part-time) and the ideal size of the student body, as well as the related staffing levels/characteristics, and then establish a plan for implementing adjustments to its current scale. Among the goals of this project are reducing the College’s reliance on tuition income and designing and executing comprehensive strategies to fund the College’s needs.

To achieve long-term institutional priorities most effectively and efficiently, the College is shifting from an annual to a long-range financial planning process. A Long-range Financial Planning Committee has been formed by the President to review current budget allocations and recommend areas for further analysis and possible budget reduction. This Committee is to support the President’s Budget Committee by identifying existing resources that could be considered for possible reallocation within the College. At present, the Long-range Financial

¹A copy of the Strategic Planning Questionnaire for Teachers College Faculty and Staff will be available in the Resource Room during the site visit.
²Section IV of the strategic plan is available in the Resource Room.
³The Strategic Planning Implementation Committee Membership List is available in the Resource Room.
Planning Committee\(^4\) has made initial progress in developing a process that examines allocations in the existing base budget and assessing whether there may be opportunities for re-allocation. This is an ongoing effort whereby over a multi-year period, all of the budgets in the administrative units and academic programs will be reviewed for appropriateness and consistency with the mission and goals of the College.

While in the process of transitioning to a long-range planning process, the College continues to follow a well-established process for developing its annual budget. Each year during the budget call period, each Vice President is asked to complete a survey to assess each unit within his or her area, along with the possibilities and needs given the budget requirements for the upcoming year. The collected data are reviewed by the Office of Budget and Planning, which oversees budget planning, budget monitoring, and auditing processes. The office is responsible for adopting an annual budget that is thoroughly communicated, fiscally responsible, and responsive to the College’s mission and goals. The annual budget process also seeks to ensure that unit operation plans, the College-wide master plan, and other strategies are integrated, comprehensive, and advanced in a unified manner. A number of committees are involved in reviewing the proposed budget. The President’s Budget Committee (consisting of eight members of the faculty and six members of the senior staff) reviews financial and budgetary data, assesses existing programs and future initiatives, and plays an important advisory role in developing the annual operational budget. The Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) Subcommittee on Finance, Facilities, and Support Services (consisting of three faculty members) is also engaged in the review of the annual operational budget and resource allocation. In addition, input and feedback are solicited from all stakeholders through open campus meetings. After faculty review, the annual budget is forwarded to the Trustees.

Using Institutional Resources Efficiently

Institutional resources include financial resources, physical facilities, equipment and supplies, information technology, library resources, and human resources. Each Vice President prepares and submits an annual report to the President. In their annual reports, each Vice President typically assesses the effectiveness of his or her operational areas and reviews progress toward goals outlined the previous year, including how well these goals were accomplished and any challenges that existed in meeting these goals. The reports also propose goals for the upcoming academic year. These reports are disseminated to the other Vice Presidents and formally discussed at the Senior Staff Summer Retreat. Feedback is collected and shared with each of the Vice President’s direct reports for appropriate action and follow-up.

Finance, Facilities, and Information Technology

The College’s annual financial statements are reviewed both internally and externally. Externally, they are audited by KPMG Peat Marwick, an independent external accounting firm. Internally, the financial statements are reviewed and approved by the College’s Audit Committee.

\(^4\)Materials related to resource allocation and budgeting, including the Long-range Financial Planning Committee Membership List, Actual Expense Data for Instructional Departments and Actual Expense Data for Non-Instructional Program Units, and the Budget Process and Development of the FY2006-07 Operating Budget Memo, are available in the Resource Room.
Committee\textsuperscript{5} which meets twice annually to review the financial statements and the external auditors’ management letter comments, and to address all instances of internal control weaknesses or improprieties at the College.

Over the last 10 years, the College has been involved in extensive studies of its physical plant and operations. A number of external and internal evaluators have been employed to accurately assess and prioritize the needs for improvement. In 1997, an architectural firm and an engineering firm were engaged to review the infrastructure of the academic plant. Their review identified nearly $15 million of infrastructure needs which were prioritized, and a Critical Plant Repair Plan was developed for the most urgent needs. Subsequent to the identification of Critical Plant Repair needs, the College completed a comprehensive analysis of physical plant needs. The needs analysis was presented to the College-wide Financial Priorities Planning Committee for a discussion within the context of Capital Campaign priorities. The Capital Projects unit oversees the ongoing activities that fulfill the College’s long-range Physical Plant Improvement Program\textsuperscript{6} (a more detailed discussion of physical plant improvements was provided in Chapters II and III).

The strategic plan identifies continuous systematic improvements to the physical plant and equipment as one of its main strategies. First, a detailed inventory of all current space and space use has been completed. As part of the second phase of the campus space analysis, an external firm was retained to provide accurate and comprehensive CAD/CAM drawings of the physical plant and to provide the College with an up-to-date inventory of current facilities utilization.\textsuperscript{7} This work is currently underway.

The College maintains a detailed, up-to-date inventory of all audio-visual and technology resources, and conducts a periodic audit of those resources as well as needs assessments. The Director of Computing and Information Services is charged with assessing and prioritizing needed improvements to instructional equipment and creating a formal equipment upgrade plan. The Microcomputer Distribution Policy states that “computer classrooms and some equipment in the labs should be upgraded every two years to provide students with current tools for relevant instruction; faculty and staff desktop computers should be replaced, on average, every four years.” Requests for new equipment are reviewed by department chairs and directors, in consultation with CIS, during the regular budget preparation cycle. A Student Technology Survey and a Faculty Technology Survey are administered to assess needs and obtain information about student and faculty preferences, satisfaction, and problems using technology at Teachers College.\textsuperscript{8}

The strategic plan states that the College has to “make major improvements to the information systems that most affect the success of students, faculty, and staff” (Strategy 1.3.1). The Technology Planning Committee, comprised of representatives from areas reporting to each of the three Vice Presidents, as well as faculty and students, was charged with identifying

\textsuperscript{5}The Audit Committee of the Trustees is currently chaired by John Klingenstein, with Trustees Antonia Grumbach and Steven Wechsler also serving.
\textsuperscript{6}The Capital Improvement Program is available in the Resource Room.
\textsuperscript{7}A copy of the Request for Proposal is available in the Resource Room. If completed prior to the site visit, copies of the physical plant rendering and space utilization will also be made available.
\textsuperscript{8}Student Technology Survey and Faculty Technology Survey Instruments will be available in the Resource Room.
technology planning priorities. It has engaged in a number of assessment and review activities, including review of extensive, existing assessments of students, faculty, and functional areas to identify near-term objectives; a review of annual reports of each of the three Vice Presidents’ areas; meetings with key administrative and support service areas to discover priority goals and current projects; and the administration of a new survey to assess technology needs for students and faculty. The Committee also reviewed best practices among higher education institutions. The recommendations and proposed investments, reviewed briefly in Chapter II, are summarized in the most recent report from the Technology Planning Committee.9

Human Resources

The Office of Human Resources is responsible for human resource management, including such evaluative functions as screening of potential applicants, assessing salary equity, overseeing performance appraisals for professional staff, and assessing professional development needs and activities.

Professional Personnel. It is the responsibility of individual departments to assess needs for professional personnel and obtain an Authorization to Recruit or Re-evaluate Appointed Part-time and Full-time Grant and Non-Grant Positions form.10 In the case of a new position, a Job Description Questionnaire, describing the position, responsibilities, and specifications, must be completed and approved by the appropriate department head. Each position is thoroughly reviewed, evaluated, and graded by the Office of Human Resources. Once approved, all credentials and other pertinent materials supplied by candidates for a position are reviewed by the department head or designee. Detailed criteria, developed to evaluate each candidate’s strengths and weaknesses in relationship to the position requirements, are evaluated and reported in writing.

All regular full-time staff are required to undergo a formal performance appraisal review at least once per year. The employee undergoes a self-appraisal by completing a Professional Performance Communication and Appraisal form before the appraisal interview with his or her supervisor. Following the appraisal interview, the incumbent, the immediate supervisor, and the next-level supervisor sign the forms.

The strategic plan states that the College has to “make meaningful, consistent investments in the skills and capabilities of everyone employed at the College” (Strategy 1.3.3.). The Office of Human Resources is responsible for assessing interests and needs for additional skills and capabilities in all areas of the College and assigning priorities, and then for identifying available programs to serve the assessed needs in a cost-effective manner. The Office of Human Resources collects and analyzes performance appraisal forms and creates professional development activities based on such analyses. The College has created an Office of Professional Development and Programming that will ideally assist in addressing needed compliance and educational development, leadership development, and cultural enhancement. It will be led by the President’s Office for Diversity and Community in collaboration with the Office of Human Resources. 

---

9The Technology Planning Priorities Report is available in the Resource Room.
10Copies of the Authorization to Recruit or Re-evaluate form, the Job Description Questionnaire, and the Professional Performance Communication and Appraisal form will available in the Resource Room.
Over the last two years, the College conducted a study of professional staff positions, job grading, and compensation; it also initiated market adjustments to make professional salaries competitive with peer intuitions. In addition to a long-range plan to adjust professional staff salaries, results of the self-study included: a revised job competency-based evaluation methodology and job grading system; a major rewriting of professional staff job descriptions; the implementation of performance appraisals and the merit pay system in the Finance and Administration area; and the implementation of personalized benefit statements for all College employees.

**Instructional Personnel.** It is the responsibility of academic departments and programs to annually assess needs for professorial personnel and to present requests/proposals for permission to recruit new faculty at a Department Chairs meeting. Requests to recruit should only be submitted for positions which are grounded in academic plans for the future and either seek to fill a recent or expected vacancy or respond to opportunities for demonstrated program growth. All permissions to recruit are carefully reviewed by the Department Chairs, the Faculty Executive Committee, and then determined by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean. The following criteria are used in addressing staffing needs: cost (cost-benefit implications for the program and department); demand (teaching and research); centrality (relevance to College, department, and program priorities); quality (required qualifications); diversity (ways to attract minority candidates); and space (as required for a proposed position). The monitoring of the faculty recruitment process is done through the Faculty Search Affirmative Action Plan, Recruitment Summaries, and Interim Reports to the College’s Affirmative Action Committee.\(^\text{11}\)

Teachers College strives to increase and maintain diversity of its faculty and instructional staff. One of the venues is the Minority Post-doctoral Fellowship, which underwent re-evaluation in 2004-05. A survey was distributed to several institutions to gather information on ways to improve the Fellowship’s comparable competitiveness and/or restructure its constitution. The Minority Post-doctoral Fellowship Survey was distributed to the American Association of Universities Dean’s listerv. In addition, the current Fellows were interviewed about their perspectives on the Fellowship’s application process, structure, timing, and other general aspects. A number of changes were made in response. The most significant changes included clearer application guidelines and an increase of potential time as a Fellow from only one year to two years.

The College’s responsibility for the performance of its faculty includes systematic and comprehensive evaluations conducted by both students\(^\text{12}\) and peers (reappointment, promotion, and tenure reviews). Evaluations are designed to collect data on the quality of faculty teaching and advising, scholarly contributions, and service. Evaluation results are used to improve Faculty performance as well as the quality of academic programs through curriculum changes and the provision of professional development.

---

\(^1\)Faculty Search Affirmative Action forms are available in the Resource Room.

\(^2\)These assessments include Course Evaluations, Student Satisfaction Survey, and Exit Survey Instruments and Summaries, which are available in the Resource Room.
Table 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related Criteria</th>
<th>Data Reported</th>
<th>Data Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Evaluations</td>
<td>Summaries of students’ feedback for each course are sent to the course instructor and department chair. They are also available to candidates through the Library.</td>
<td>Instructors review the data and make changes to their courses as needed. In the case of a strongly negative evaluation, the department chair meets with the Faculty member to discuss ways to address the criticism and provide necessary support. Results are also used in reappointment, tenure, and promotion reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>Summaries of data are presented to program faculty, appropriate faculty committees, and unit administration.</td>
<td>Teachers College Faculty and administration review data and make appropriate recommendations to programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit and Graduate Survey</td>
<td>Summaries of data are presented to program faculty, appropriate faculty committees, and unit administration.</td>
<td>Program faculty reflect on the data and make changes to the program as needed. Committees review the data and make policy recommendations, if necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, annual teaching observations are conducted for all pre-tenure faculty, and written summaries of meetings are addressed to the faculty member and forwarded to the Dean’s Office.

For reappointment, appointment to tenure, and promotion in rank, each faculty member’s performance is evaluated based on three criteria: scholarly productivity in research, teaching and advisement, and service to the College and the profession. The evaluation is qualitative rather than quantitative, and decisions about reappointment, promotion, and tenure are, in the final analysis, clinical. “The complexities of faculty performance cannot be reduced to numerical terms and then statistically combined or weighted to yield some final figure that will represent quality or level of performance in any meaningful way. Good clinical assessment requires the collection of comprehensive and valid data on which to base judgments. Fair and equitable treatment of individual faculty members requires that the evidence be evaluated and the recommendations be made by colleagues who have the expertise, the experience, and the concern to render such judgments in an impartial and discriminating manner.”

The College-Wide Means lists the types of information and methods of collecting information within the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service by which the faculty within the College are evaluated. Although the areas in which a faculty member is expected to demonstrate

---

13 A copy of the current policies governing the initial appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure as well as the College-Wide Means are included in the Faculty Handbook and are available in the Resource Room.
14 “Principles Governing the Reappointment of Full-time Members of the Faculty, Promotion in Academic Rank, and the Award of Tenure at Teachers College,” p. 7.
competence remain constant, the standards reflect necessary and sufficient levels of performance which vary with the stage of the individual’s career and the type of review.

Table 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Type</th>
<th>Time Point</th>
<th>Dossier</th>
<th>Reviewers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment of Non-tenured Faculty and Promotion to Associate Professor</td>
<td>By the end of the 3rd year of service for tenure track; by the end of the 3rd year for term appointments</td>
<td>(1) Curriculum vitae; (2) Statement of professional plans; (3) Copy of each scholarly product; (4) Evaluations of teaching and advisement; (5) All written appraisals, if any; (6) External evaluation letters; (7) Any other relevant materials</td>
<td>Department faculty, department chair, Dean, President, Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award of Tenure</td>
<td>By the end of the 6th year of service</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Department faculty, department chair, Standing Committee on Appointment and Tenure, Dean, President, Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Full Professor</td>
<td>As requested</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
<td>Department faculty, department chair, Standing Committee on Promotion to Full Professor, Dean, President, Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Subcommittee on Academic Personnel, which represents Faculty in matters pertaining to the formulation and implementation of personnel policies and practices, has undertaken a review of personnel policies and procedures for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and appointment to tenure, and a revised version is included in the 2005-06 Faculty Handbook.

In 2004, the Faculty Salary Committee, at the request of the President and the Dean, undertook a review of alternative salary and compensation systems that might more effectively support the College’s mission as a Research I institution. The Faculty Salary Committee also collaborates with the College in annual reviews of average faculty salaries at Teachers College, compared with average faculty salaries by rank among a set of peer institutions. The collaborative review and analysis determined that, in 2004-05, average salaries at Teachers College at the rank of Full Professor were below the average faculty salary at that rank across a comparison set of peer institutions. In addition to the annual faculty salary increase, a parity increase equivalent to 1% of the total faculty salary pool in 2005, was approved based on the results of the 2004-05 review and allocated to faculty at the rank of Full Professor.
Library Resources

At the time of the 2001 Period Review Report, we had reported that the College had been engaged in a major effort to re-imagine and re-position the library as a key component of overall programs and services for students, faculty, and staff. Those efforts—which were broadly participatory—led us to conclude that the library of the future at Teachers College, in addition to its traditional role as a repository of materials with assistance to access them, will include the following new major roles: The library as academic social space; the library as instructional technology leader; and the library as an environment to support student and faculty production. These new roles—as well as the restructuring and redesign of library operations and services—were reviewed in Chapter II.

Briefly, it is important to note here that both the physical renovations and definition/implementation of new roles and structures have been undertaken within the context of a systematic, comprehensive review and assessment. As mentioned, over the past eight years, the library has been engaged in ongoing efforts to monitor changing patron needs. These efforts were led by the members of the Library Seminar, a diverse group of faculty, College leaders, library staff, and Trustees who developed the plans for the renovation for the library facilities in Russell Hall. Efforts early in this period included open community meetings, focus groups, surveys from faculty and students, and interactive presentations to a wide array of groups throughout the campus. These data-gathering efforts involved facilities planning consultants and the architect team retained to design the renovated library facilities.

With the opening of the library facility, the Library Seminar and the library staff have monitored patron responses and use patterns. Continued informal monitoring is being enhanced by the establishment of an ongoing research and evaluation effort designed to inform and drive further changes and enhancements in library services. The library research and evaluation activities will draw on data routinely gathered and reported by library staff and supplemented by special data-gathering efforts. The Library Seminar is now engaged in planning for the second stage of the library renovation. The Seminar will be pursuing the same types of data-gathering efforts used to drive the design of the first phase of the renovation.

Leadership, Governance, and Administration

Chapter III of our self-study report, which focuses on Standards 4 and 5, provided an extended definition of Leadership, Governance, and Administration at the College. That chapter demonstrated how the College’s system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making, and, further, that the governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development consistent with the mission of the College. Additionally, Chapter III described administrative structure and services, and illustrated how they support the programs of teaching/learning, research/scholarship, and service, while also assuring quality improvement and support for the College’s organization and governance.

A Trustee is elected by vote of a majority of the Trustees at any regular meeting or at any special meeting called for that purpose. Each Trustee serves for a term of three years without
compensation. Upon the conclusion of a Trustee’s term, the Trustee is eligible for re-election. In addition, a Chair and one or more Vice Chairs of the Trustees are elected at the annual meeting of the Trustees each year by vote of a majority of the Trustees. Such election is a special order of business at that annual meeting. The Chair and the Vice Chair(s) hold their office for one year, and may be subsequently re-elected.

Upon the filing and examination of a written complaint against a Trustee by a fellow Trustee for misconduct, incapacity or neglect of duty, a Trustee may be removed or suspended. Such removal or suspension requires the vote of a majority of the Trustees. However, all Trustees, including the Trustee accused of the misconduct, incapacity or neglect of duty, will be given at least one week’s notice prior to the vote. A Trustee’s position will be considered vacant under the following circumstances: death, resignation, refusal to act, removal from office, expiration of term or in any other manner specified in Article 5, Part I, Subdivision 4 of Section 226 of the Education Law of New York. Furthermore, should any Trustee fail to attend three consecutive regular meetings without excuse accepted as satisfactory by a majority of the Trustees, such Trustee shall be deemed to have resigned the position and the position will be considered vacant.

In the event that a Trustee is unable to serve his or her entire term for any reason, a new Trustee may be elected to serve the unexpired term. In the event that a Trustee position remains vacant for greater than one year or should a vacancy reduce the total number of Trustees to less than two-thirds of the required number of Trustees, the vacancies will be filled by the Regents of the University of the State of New York. Furthermore, any Trustee is subject to removal by the Regents for misconduct, incapacity, neglect of duty or when the corporation fails to carry out its educational purposes. Prior to such Trustee’s removal, the Trustee will have a hearing before the Board of Regents or a committee thereof. The Trustee will be entitled to at least 10 days’ notice of the time and place of the hearing.

All Teachers College policies on governance and administration are stated in appropriate documents which are revised periodically by appropriate subcommittees. The Board of Trustees of the College and the faculty recently reviewed the Statutes and Bylaws, and the Faculty Handbook was substantially revised in 2004-05.

Table 5.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Ratified/Adopted</th>
<th>Last Revised/Amended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statutes and Bylaws</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees Handbook</td>
<td>Every 5 years</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Handbook</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Handbook</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Senate Charter</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff Policy Manual</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Mission Statement</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Search Guide</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment Disclosure Form</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Property Policy</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College Catalog</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers College has a structured and collaborative approach to the process for the development and review of existing administrative policies and procedures. The Management Network, composed of directors and managers representing all major operational areas of the College, acts as a catalyst for the recommendation of new policies and procedures and for proposing changes or modifications to existing policies. It has been instrumental in several initiatives, including the development and refinement of the annual professional staff performance appraisal process, and more recently, the development of implementation of a cross-College framework to create, review, and implement new administrative policies.

Briefly, the “policy on policies” establishes the Policy Advisory Group (PAG) and charges that group with the primary responsibility for administrative policy development. Specifically, PAG responds to the demonstrated need for a new/revised administrative policy, establishes a policy development team and manages the development and multi-layered review of a proposed policy. The review process is structured to provide multiple opportunities for review and comment by appropriate constituencies on proposed policies and operating procedures and to then incorporate feedback into subsequent revisions to proposed policies. The outcome is the development of administrative policies and procedures that are supportive of the College’s mission and goals.

The organizational charts which define authority, responsibilities, and chain of command within each of the three Vice Presidents’ areas are reviewed periodically. Necessary changes are made to meet emerging external pressures, facilitate learning and research, and foster quality improvement. Illustrative of these adaptations are the recent additions of the Office of Policy and Research, Office of Teacher Education and School-based Support Services, and Office of Accreditation and Assessment, described in Chapter III.

The strategic plan states that the College has to “make any required changes in the College’s governance structures to support the future directions and scale of the institution” (Strategy 2.2.3). A working group (to be assembled) will identify and assess governing documents and structures for continuing effectiveness under the strategic plan.

Teachers College conducts periodic assessments of the integrity evidenced in institutional policies, processes, and practices, and the manner in which these are implemented. A number of College-wide committees are charged with monitoring Teachers College’s institutional integrity and climate and developing appropriate policies and procedures. These committees include: Committee on Community and Diversity, the Affirmative Action Committee, the Faculty Advisory Committee, and the Committee on Conflict of Interest and Commitment. The Committee on Conflict of Interest and Commitment, for example, annually sends out a Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment Annual Disclosure Form, which asks faculty and professional staff to evaluate their professional activities in light of the College’s policies. These forms are reviewed by the faculty or professional staff member’s Vice President and then by the Committee if an unresolved conflict exists.

---

15 Descriptions of each of the referenced committees—Committee on Community and Diversity, Affirmative Action Committee, Faculty Advisory Committee, Committee on Conflict of Interest and Commitment—are included in the Faculty Handbook, which is available to the site visit team in the Resource Room. The Intellectual Property policy and the Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment policies are also provided in the Faculty Handbook.
Academic Programs

Teachers College is committed to the continuing improvement of its programs of instruction and research. In evaluating the effectiveness of its academic offerings, it relies on internal and external studies. Recently, all of the Master’s-level teacher preparation and educational leadership programs have gone through re-registration by the New York State Department of Education. The re-registration included paper review of program curricula, graduation and certification requirements, and assessment practices. In addition, the College’s programs preparing professional personnel to work in P-12 settings were accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). As part of the NCATE review, a number of programs submitted program reports to their respective professional associations. These reports were reviewed in relation to professional standards and 13 programs were recognized as meeting professional standards in their disciplines. In addition to NCATE accreditation, other programs accredited by the professional associations include School Psychology (American Psychological Association [APA]), Speech and Language Pathology (American Speech and Hearing Association [ASHA]), and Nutrition Education (Commission on Accreditation for Dietetics Education [CADE]). Additionally, Teachers College Ph.D. programs are periodically reviewed by Columbia University’s Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, under whose auspices all Ph.D. degrees are awarded, to ensure both compliance with University regulations and the continued strength and excellence of the programs.

Internally, all new academic programs or courses and changes to the existing programs or courses are reviewed by the FEC Subcommittee on the Academic Program Subcommittee (APS). Recently, the APS has developed and implemented new procedures for both new course proposals and new program proposals. With respect to new course approvals, the new processes more closely align the approval of new courses with core faculty and degree program requirements, and reduce redundancy or overlap with existing offerings. With respect to new programs, the review process now more directly links new program approval with key indicators, including demonstrated commitment to the mission and standards of the College; evidence of program need and students to be served, with clear evidence of sustainable market; lack of overlap or duplication with existing programs and the extent of competition among other institutions in the region; and clear staffing and budget plans. The effectiveness of courses and programs is evaluated through course evaluation, student satisfaction, and exit surveys, which are described in more detail in our response to Standard 14 (Chapter VII).

Recommendations

At the core of the strategic plan is the necessity for ongoing, comprehensive evaluation of programs and services to support continuing improvement and institutional renewal. In that context, the key recommendation of this chapter supports establishing a formal program of evaluation and renewal for all instructional programs and centers/institutes within the College to support continuing excellence in scholarship, teaching, research, and contributions to their disciplines. More specific assessment and evaluation recommendations are brought forward in subsequent chapters.

The strategic plan also calls for routine communication with the College community regarding progress on each of the strategic planning initiatives. The challenges inherent in
sustaining commitment to and engagement with a series of multi-year initiatives underscore the importance of regular communication. Complementing the recommendation in Chapter II, we encourage incorporating an explicit assessment component in the communication plan.

Applauding the recent establishment of the Office of Professional Development and Programming, and the collaboration between Human Resources and the Office of Diversity and Community, and concurring with the recommendation to undertake a complete review and overhaul of the current performance appraisal system for professional staff, we strongly encourage linking staff development programming with performance appraisal outcomes.

With respect to the evaluation and assessment of faculty, the College has a well-developed set of personnel policies and procedures that provide for the careful and comprehensive evaluation of faculty for reappointment, for appointment to tenure, and for promotion in rank. While several opportunities are available for informal review or assessment of different aspects of faculty performance post-tenure, there is no formal, systematic system of post-tenure review or evaluation of faculty. This surfaced as an area of concern in our recently completed NCATE accreditation review. We recommend that, following the completion of the current review and revision of existing personnel policies and procedures that govern reappointment, promotion, and tenure, the administration and faculty collaborate toward the goal of developing and implementing a formal post-tenure review process for faculty.
CHAPTER VI: EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

STANDARDS 8 AND 9
Student Admission and Student Support Services

Introduction

This section of our self-study report addresses two standards related to Educational Effectiveness: Standard 8—Student Admission, and Standard 9—Student Support Services. As these two areas of institutional activity are primarily the province of the Office of Enrollment and Student Services (OESS), we describe and evaluate the operations of OESS in some detail. Additionally, certain aspects of Standard 9 go beyond the purview of OESS alone and are also addressed in this chapter. In particular, the Office of Residential Services and the Office of Safety and Security, the Office of Student Accounts, Computing and Information Services (under the Vice President of Finance), and the Office of Diversity and Community (in the President’s Office) play important roles in student life at Teachers College. Finally, this chapter reviews the student grievance system, a set of processes in which a number of offices across the institution participate in important ways.

This report is divided into five main sections. The first section focuses on the Office of Enrollment and Student Services, which houses admissions and most of student services. The discussion reviews the College’s objectives in establishing the Office and provides preliminary evidence to document how those intentions have been realized to date. The second section examines the admissions process, with a particular focus on the role that financial aid plays in that process. The third section discusses student services as delivered by those offices organized within OESS: Registrar/Doctoral Studies, Student Activities and Programs, International Services, Access/Services for Individuals with Disabilities, and Career Services. Following this, the fourth section examines the student service offices housed outside Enrollment and Student Services, including the Offices of Diversity and Community, Residential Services, Safety and Security, Student Accounts, and Computing and Information Services. A discussion of how student grievances and student records are handled at Teachers College is included here as well. The report ends with the fifth section, a summary of recommendations.

Office of Enrollment and Student Services

The Office of Enrollment and Student Services (OESS) merits particular attention as it has the widest engagement with College operations pertaining to Standards 8 and 9. Headed by Donald C. Martin, Associate Dean for Enrollment and Student Services, the Office employs 70 staff members (with 11 direct reports). As the senior student affairs officer at the College reporting directly to the Vice President of Academic Affairs and Dean of the College, the Associate Dean for Enrollment and Student Services manages departments addressing the student experience, beginning from the point of inquiry through to graduation, including marketing, admission, financial aid, and registrar. The Associate Dean also manages new student orientation and leadership development, student activities and programs, student government, health and wellness programs, student conduct, career services, access and services for disabled students, and international student services. Furthermore, the Associate Dean serves as the Chair of the Student Affairs Committee of the Trustees.
All professionals working under the OESS umbrella hold at least a Bachelor’s degree and/or belong to one or more of 30 professional associations including the American Psychological Association (APA), the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE), the American College Health Association (ACHA), the American Association of University Women (AAUW), and the New York State Financial Aid Administrator’s Association. Several have served in leadership roles in these organizations or have earned special professional certifications. Many hold one or more Master’s degrees, and at least three have earned doctorates. An organizational chart for OESS is provided below.

OESS: Preliminary Assessment

The Office of Enrollment and Student Services was established in response to a number of assessments and evaluations which had underscored the importance of more systematically and effectively addressing issues related to the quality of the student experience. The most recent driver was the strategic planning process in which the College was engaged. The strategic planning process had engaged the community in a discussion of how best to maintain the College’s identity as a first-rate professional school while simultaneously establishing itself as a highly regarded graduate research institution. The results of this discussion led the Dean to propose—with strong support from the Student Senate—the establishment of a new position of Associate Dean of Enrollment and Student Services, bringing together admissions, financial aid, the registrar, and student services. The aim of this new unit was to provide a comprehensive, integrated suite of services all directed to improving the quality of the student experience at the College.

Soon after the official “unveiling” of OESS in July, 2004, a number of initiatives were introduced that focused first and foremost on improving staff responsiveness and efficiency. An official definition of customer service was implemented, along with 10 customer service guidelines. In May, 2005, the entire OESS staff participated in a two-day customer training experience. Between August, 2004 and August, 2005, complaints about service in the OESS dropped by half.
While Fall, 2005, marked the start of only the second academic year for OESS, preliminary evidence suggested that the initiative has had a continued positive impact on the student experience and the quality and effectiveness of student services. The Orientation Program, called the New Student Experience, was expanded from one day (the Tuesday after Labor Day) to five days (the Friday before Labor Day through the following Tuesday), and by all reports was successful and well-received. The second annual New Student Survey was distributed in October, 2005. All incoming students were asked to provide feedback on both the new student orientation and their interactions with the OESS. Whereas 51% of incoming students completed the first survey in October, 2004, 42% completed the second survey. They gave high marks for the newly revamped New Student Experience, and every department in the OESS received an increase in positive feedback—some departments substantially so (see Table 6.1).

Table 6.1. New Student Survey Results 2005 vs. 2004: OESS Offices Listed in Order of Mean Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Services</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Services for</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Associate Dean</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Services</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.094</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the past 18-20 months, several key organizational changes were made within OESS. For example, to improve communication, coordination, and the consistent delivery of services to students, the directors of the various student service offices now meet regularly, much as the enrollment service directors were already doing. All offices within OESS are currently undergoing a comprehensive review of their organization and operational practices; to date, reviews have been completed for the Office of Financial Aid and the Office of Admission. As a result of these reviews, staffing and programming changes have been implemented. The Office of the Registrar and Doctoral Studies will undergo review during the Spring, 2006, semester. Additionally, the entire OESS staff have participated in cross-training to learn about and comment on the practices of other offices within OESS. Also, as mentioned earlier, all staff completed customer service training, a program that will continue on an alternate-year cycle.

Moreover, several changes have been made with respect to students. For example, the financial aid and student accounts processes have been modified to provide quicker and more complete information to applicants, as well as admitted and enrolled students. A new survey of incoming students was inaugurated in Fall, 2004, repeated in Fall, 2005, and will be repeated in

---

1The survey used a 5-point scale, where 1 = Excellent and 5 = Unsatisfactory.
successive Fall terms. The Office of Student Activities and Programs (OSAP) has significantly enhanced their weekly electronic update for students; the health insurance and immunizations services have been completely reorganized; the Graduate Writing Center has been re-structured and is offering additional programming. Bulletin boards around campus have been updated and are being maintained on a weekly basis. This year, funds were allocated to the OSAP for use in sponsoring various student group initiatives.

The Admission Process

This section of Chapter VI reviews the admissions process from point of initial inquiry or contact with the College through to eventual matriculation of students. Described in detail are the process and rubrics for the evaluation of the admission application, data on the effectiveness and quality of the process, and the use of financial aid in attracting new students.

Mission

It is impossible to understate the importance of an effective, professional program of student recruitment and admission to the College. The admission and enrollment of a highly able, diverse pool of students to the College is integral to the College’s teaching, research, and service missions. In light of this, the Office of Admission has set for itself the following mission:

- promote the College and its programs of study to prospective students and their representatives, as well as to the public at large; and
- admit and enroll students who reflect the values and commitment of the College faculty and administration, and ensure those students a smooth and seamless transition from the inquiry stage to the initial enrollment stage by implementing effective enrollment management strategies.

To carry out this mission, the Office has made these further pledges:

- a commitment to attracting, selecting, and enrolling highly-qualified students of diverse interests, ethnicities, and socio-economic backgrounds;
- staff providing honest, accurate, and clear information about each graduate program and Teachers College in general;
- a sensitivity to diverse clientele and others with whom the Office works;
- an open line of communication with faculty, staff, students, and other constituencies with whom the Office works; and
- integrity and cooperation with other school units (Financial Aid, Residential Services, Registrar).

The review and data provided below illustrate the effectiveness of the Office of Admission in meeting these goals and commitments.
The Admission Cycle

Teachers College communicates with approximately 120,000 potential students per year through direct mail and other advertising efforts. Approximately 16,000 prospects actually inquire each year; that is, approximately 16,000 individuals contact the Office of Admission wishing to receive more information. The pool of inquirers come from a variety of sources. From the annual New Admit Survey (sent each year since 1993 to all admitted students, including those who have enrolled as well as those who declined enrollment), most admitted students report that they “always knew about TC” or had heard about the College’s programs from nationally-distributed guides such as Peterson’s and U.S. News, or through recommendations of friends, family, and professors at other schools. Relatively few new admits report responding to a direct advertising piece. These inquirers generate about 5,000 applications, of which about 60% are accepted. Ultimately, about 1,300-1,400 students enroll in the College. The admission pipeline for the Summer and Fall terms of 2004 and 2005 is illustrated in the table below.

Table 6.2. Admission Pipeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer/Fall 2004</th>
<th>Summer/Fall 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>4,753</td>
<td>5,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admittees</td>
<td>3,047</td>
<td>3,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depositors</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculants</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>1,493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial Approach to Potential Applicants. Prospective students receive information about Teachers College in a number of ways, including print ads, electronic media, direct mail, and alumni referrals. Between mid-August and early November, the Office of Admission mails a targeted direct mail piece (the Prospectus) to roughly 120,000 prospects. The Prospectus has replaced the catalog as the first source of information (after the search piece) for prospective students. However, students’ primary source of information has become the Office’s website (www.tc.columbia.edu/admissions). From this site, students can obtain application information and criteria, view a schedule of upcoming events, participate in online or virtual events, and apply for admission.

Responding to Inquiries. The College receives its largest number of inquiries between mid-August and early November. Roughly 16,000 prospects ask for information via the Internet, mail, phone calls, attendance at events sponsored by the Admission Office, and visits to the Office. All inquirers—including those attending college recruitment events or admissions information sessions and visiting the Admission office—are given the Prospectus.

For programs that require testing, primarily at the doctoral level, students can obtain information from the Admission Office website as well as from application materials. Students are encouraged to visit program-specific websites for additional information on testing or other requirements they may need to complete their applications for admission.

Applications. Approximately 5,000 prospects end up applying to the College, and do so through various means:
• online by visiting www.tc.edu/admissions and clicking “Apply Online.” Applications submitted electronically receive the same consideration as applications submitted on paper. Currently 50% of applicants apply using the online technology, and that number has been growing each year.

• on paper, securing the application online in the form of a PDF file available through the Teachers College Admission website: www.tc.edu/admissions.

• on paper, securing the application by mail, phone or in person from the Office of Admission.

For applicants wishing to start in the Summer or Fall Semesters, the deadlines are as follows: December 15 for Ph.D. and all psychology doctoral programs; January 2 and April 1 (early and final) for Ed.D. programs; and January 15 and April 15 (early and final) for Master’s programs. For applicants wishing to start in the Spring Semester, the early deadline for all degrees and programs is November 1. Students must meet the early deadline to be considered for scholarships. Admission applications received after the early deadlines may be considered on a space available basis.

**Notification of Admission Decision.** The College accepts about 3,000 applications. The admit rate in 2005 was just under 60%, including doctoral applicants who were not admitted to a doctoral program of study, but who were offered alternative admission to a Master’s-level program. The length of the application review process varies from program to program. Early applicants (those who meet the published early application deadlines) are notified by March 15 each year. Applications not received by the deadline date may be held for review for the next available semester.

**Deposit.** To ensure a place in a program, admitted students must return the Admission Response Form that accompanies their letter of admission, with a $300.00 (U.S.) check or money order payable to Teachers College. This non-refundable admission deposit is due by May 15 each year. Approximately 1,500 students make an initial acceptance of the College’s admission offer by making a deposit.

**Matriculation.** Approximately 1,300-1,400 students eventually enroll at Teachers College, representing a 10-15% “melt” between deposit and matriculation. Overall, the College had a yield rate (proportion of applicants who eventually matriculate) of about 47% in 2005.

**Deferral of Admission.** Students may defer their admission to a Master’s program for one year. Those admitted to doctoral programs must have the permission of the program to which they were admitted to defer an offer of admission. Requests for deferral of admission must be made in writing to the Office of Admission.

**Review and Evaluation of Applications**

The admit rate (the percentage of applicants who are admitted) has decreased in recent years, making admission to the College more selective. In 2001, the admission rate was 70%, while in 2005, it was just under 60%.
Teachers College is a graduate school that requires a baccalaureate degree from an accredited educational institution for program admission. The requirements for academic content preparation at the point of admission to the degree programs will vary by degree level and from program to program, but typically include a liberal arts or science background and demonstrated knowledge in content areas (at least 24 credit hours).

For most programs of study at Teachers College, faculty members have the responsibility and authority for admission decisions at the College. However, 12 of the 65 programs of study have asked the staff in the Office of Admission to make admission decisions for the M.A. degree, utilizing admission criteria set by the program.

With respect to the admission process for most programs, a Faculty Admission Committee reviews all aspects of every application. The Committee generally adopts a holistic approach in reviewing each applicant’s materials, considering applicants both individually and within the context of other applicants to the program in a given term or year. Among a range of items, the Committee considers an applicant’s previous academic record, the personal statement, professional references, and other evidence of personal and professional accomplishment and promise. In general, programs require a minimum 3.0 GPA. GPAs and test scores or prior academic coursework are important, but not sufficient criteria for admission.

Students have the opportunity to appeal a decision made only if there is new information that the admission Committee has never seen before. The first stage in the appeal process is to the Director of Admission, who will review a request for an appeal and provide a written response within two weeks. If the student is not satisfied with the decision rendered by the Director of Admission, as a last stage of the appeal process he/she can request to meet with the Associate Dean for Enrollment and Student Services.

Enrollment Decision

Since 1993, a New Admit Survey has been sent every year to all students who are admitted to Teachers College, whether they plan to enroll or not. The survey has provided a wealth of information, particularly on what prospective students find attractive about Teachers College as well as the reasons some choose not to enroll.

Approximately two-thirds of those who chose to come to Teachers College rated as very important factors the “fit” of the program and their interests, the general reputation of Teachers College and of the program, and the quality of the program faculty.

The primary reason that students do not enroll (cited by nearly half of those who chose another college) is that they received a more attractive aid package or award from another school. About one-third said they did not come to Teachers College because it was not their first choice; they did not receive adequate financial aid; or Teachers College was too expensive, compared to other schools. The location of the College is also sometimes a factor in students’ decisions not to enroll (cited by 15% of those who chose another college).

The survey clearly identifies the College’s major competitors as New York University (NYU) and Harvard. Application overlap with NYU is twice as frequent as application overlap with Harvard, and four times more frequent than with any other school.
The survey results have remained fairly consistent from year to year, and some of the results have led to strategic responses. Since the late-1990s through the 2003 administration of the survey, the gap in the quality of admissions outreach between Teachers College and its competitors had grown: students who were admitted to Teachers College consistently rated the quality of information and services provided by the Admission Office as better from the other colleges they applied to than from Teachers College. In response to this, the College has moved application deadlines to dates that are more consistent with other schools so that more timely admissions decisions can be made. The College has also taken measures to increase both the quantity and the quality of personal contacts with prospective students. With support from OESS, program faculty have become more involved in personal outreach to prospective students. All staff in the Admission Office have completed customer service training and the professional staff have participated in presentation training to provide information most effectively. As a result, in 2004, the gap in quality of admissions outreach between Teachers College and its competitors was cut in half, and in 2005, the quality of outreach from Teachers College was rated better than its competitors.

Financial Aid

Data from the New Admit Survey underscore the primary reason why students who are admitted to Teachers College often choose to go to other schools: namely, the College is not able to offer the types or levels of scholarship support common at other graduate schools. As a financially-independent, graduate-level-only institution, Teachers College does not have an undergraduate enrollment tuition revenue base that would provide the resources to support more competitive funding for its graduate students. The following section describes the available financial aid resources at the College.

Forms of Aid

In 2003-2004, Teachers College students received $55.8 million in aid in the form of loans and scholarships, accounting for 78% of the tuition students paid. The remainder was met by personal or family resources.

Loans. While nearly 80% of tuition is covered by aid, the majority of that aid ($42.1 million) comes in the form of loans. Many students at Teachers College finance their educational expenses with federally-guaranteed loans under the Stafford, Federal Direct Loan or Perkins Loan programs. In addition are alternative loan programs administered by private institutions that provide funds to students who do not qualify for federal loans or who may need additional funding.

The loan volume for the 2004-2005 fiscal year is illustrated in the table below.

Approximately 32% of Teachers College students borrow funds from the federal loan programs, and 6% borrow from alternative private sources. Currently, graduate students may borrow up to $18,500 per year, with an aggregate loan limit of approximately $180,000. The over $42 million borrowed in 2004-2005 covered over 50% of the tuition paid by students.
Table 6.3. Loan Volume by Source, Fiscal Year (2004-2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2004-2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford and Direct Loan</td>
<td>$32,936,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td>$1,094,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$8,075,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Loans</td>
<td>$42,105,720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarships. Students receive roughly $19 million in scholarships, which cover about 25% of students’ tuition payments. These scholarship funds come from three sources: (a) institutionally-generated tuition discount points; (b) supplementary Teachers College sources; and (c) externally-granted scholarships. These sources and their amounts are provided in the table below.

(a) Tuition Discount Points. Institutionally-generated tuition discounts amounted to $7 million in 2004-2005, benefiting over 1,200 students and accounting for about 9% of Teachers College tuition revenue. These tuition discounts take four different forms: the General Scholarship Program (open to all students); the Minority Group Scholarship Program (restricted to students who are identified as members of racial or ethnic minority groups and students with disabilities); the International Student Scholarship Program (open only to international students); and the Grant-in-Aid Scholarship. Information about these scholarships is available on the Office of Financial Aid website.

Awards under the first three scholarship programs are largely decided by academic program Faculty. It has been College practice over the past several years to index the level of scholarship support to increases in tuition rates: as the tuition rate increases, the budgetary commitment to support these programs increases proportionately. Allocations to individual departments and programs are based on a comprehensive review of scholarship practice and the development of enrollment plans for each department or program. For example, additional funds were provided to the reading specialist program to build its minority student enrollment.

Grant-in-Aid funds are awarded primarily to doctoral students during the last two semesters of graduate work. This scholarship considers on both merit and demonstrated financial need. A committee makes the award decisions, but faculty recommendations in support of Grant-in-Aid applications are required. In addition, international students are required to seek approval from the International Student Advisor. Applications are available online and in the Office of Financial Aid, and must be filed by September 15 for the Fall and February 1 for the Spring.
Table 6.4. Total Scholarship Volume (by Source) in 2004-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2004-2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutionally-Generated Tuition Discounts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College Minority Group Scholarships</td>
<td>$2,071,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College General Scholarships</td>
<td>$4,428,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College International Scholarships</td>
<td>$544,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$7,043,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplementary Institutional Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed and Gift Funds</td>
<td>$1,643,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Training Grants or Contracts</td>
<td>$2,533,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College Tuition Exemption</td>
<td>$2,034,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College Graduate Assistantships</td>
<td>$693,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$6,905,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-party Payments</td>
<td>$2,749,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnard and Columbia University Exemption</td>
<td>$2,357,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$5,106,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Scholarships</strong></td>
<td>$19,056,104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Other Teachers College-generated Scholarship Funding. Scholarship aid also comes from internal Teachers College sources such as annual income from endowed and gift accounts restricted to scholarship aid; scholarship support provided through extramurally-funded research projects and training grants; tuition exemption awarded to students on the basis of employment at the College; and funding for Graduate Assistants. The total funding in this second category of internally-generated scholarship aid totaled just under $7 million in 2004-2005, which accounted for 9% of Teachers College tuition revenue.

Tuition exemption awarded to students on the basis of employment at the College amounted to about $2 million in 2004-2005. Support provided through extramurally-funded research projects and training grants amounted to $2.5 million, and endowed scholarships provided $1.6 million in aid. Teachers College has over 300 endowed funds, the majority of which are specific to a particular program, with program faculty making the award decision generally before the beginning of the academic year. In addition, many endowed scholarships are available College-wide (for example, the Petrie New York City Fellowship, the Rose Fellows, the Jewish Foundation for the Education of Women, and the Nicholson Family Fellowship). For these, decisions are typically made by a College-wide committee that makes either the awards decision or recommendations to the donor.
Inaugurated in AY 1999-2000, institutional support for stipends for graduate assistantships has grown to $700,000 in 2004-2005. In addition to a stipend, assistantships also provide scholarship points: graduate assistants receive 1 point of tuition for every $500 of salary, up to a maximum of 3 points per semester and 6 points per academic year.

Externally-funded Scholarships. The final category of scholarships comes from external sources, including third-party payments (from unions, employers or foundations—$2.75 million) and tuition exemptions for staff from Barnard and Columbia University ($2.35 million). These payments to over 500 students totaled $5.1 million in 2004-2005 and covered 6% of Teachers College tuition revenues.

Federal Work Study (FWS) funds are allocated to several Teachers College departments and offices, which then create and offer jobs to FWS awardees. However, not all departments and offices have FWS funds with which to offer FWS jobs. FWS awards may be used only in those departments/offices which have an FWS budget. Placement in an FWS position is contingent upon availability of jobs and funding.

Evaluation of Admission and Financial Aid Procedures

The Offices of Admission and Financial Aid continue to evaluate all of their programs/services and procedures throughout the application cycle. Prospective students evaluate recruitment events and information sessions; admitted students evaluate admitted student weekends and yield events; and all admitted students are asked to complete a lengthy survey on both the admission and financial aid processes. All students at the College are asked to complete a satisfaction survey during the Spring term, and several items on that survey relate to admission and financial aid. Moreover, data are available on the characteristics of students at each stage of the admission process.

The following section presents data that shed light on the operations of the two offices, particularly their degree of success in realizing the goals of securing a diverse entering class and providing prospective students with effective service.

Realization of the Goal of a Diverse Class

The Admission Office maintains an extensive recruitment presence, nationally and internationally. As a result, Teachers College enrolls a highly diverse population each year. Among the new students who matriculated in Fall, 2005, the average age of the students was 31 years, and over 30% of the students identified themselves as students of color. Part-time students constitute the majority (71%) of the student body, and women make up the great majority (80%) of the student population.

The following table provides further details on the demographic characteristics of Teachers College applicants, admittees, depositors, and enrollees. Relatively little variation is seen in student characteristics across these four stages of the student admission process. However, it is interesting to note that the proportion of individuals who are white, native-born, and over the age of 25 increases fairly steadily as one moves from application and acceptance to deposit and enrollment. This may signal the impact of socio-economic advantages that allow some students to better realize their goal of attending Teachers College.
Table 6.5. Social Background of Students at Different Stages of the Admission Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applicants %</th>
<th>Admittees %</th>
<th>Depositors %</th>
<th>Enrollees %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (2003-2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (2004-2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin (2004-05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-born</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (2003-2004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 or younger</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 26-40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41 and older</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of the Admission staff have clearly articulated the challenges they face in persuading admitted students from lower socio-economic backgrounds to enroll at the College without additional scholarship support. In response, the College allocated additional resources to assist the Offices of Admission and Financial Aid to yield students from across the spectrum. These supplemental scholarship resources are awarded centrally rather than through departments. Students are chosen for awards based on demographic criteria (e.g., geographic diversity, socio-economic status, or attendance at historically black colleges and universities or other targeted feeder colleges). With additional resources allocated, the College should be able to attract and enroll a more diverse applicant pool. Additional financial aid resources will also allow the College to compete more easily for the most talented students in the application pool. While the overall average GPA scores of admitted students has risen, currently, approximately 54% of admitted students with undergraduate GPAs between 3.00 and 3.25 enroll at the College, but only 39% with GPAs between 3.75 and 4.0 enroll. A similar trend exists for GRE scores, with less than 30% of admitted students with GRE scores of 700 and above enrolling.

Diversity of Distribution of Financial Aid

The following table presents figures on the distribution of financial aid (excluding loans) in Fall, 2004 by student demographic characteristics. It also illustrates some significant differences in aid receipt. Doctoral students can cover much more of their tuition by aid than Master’s students, but doctoral numbers still lag behind the full tuition that is often available at other institutions. Students of color have significantly more of their tuition covered by aid than other students, which is to be expected since over $2,000,000 in scholarship aid is specifically marked for diversity. Women receive somewhat less aid than men, primarily as a result of men being more concentrated in doctoral programs: 47% of male degree students seek the doctorate while only 35% of female degree students do.
Table 6.6. Background of Students Receiving Financial Aid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of Tuition Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or Origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino(a)</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness and Efficiency of the Admission and Financial Aid Processes

Every Spring, the College conducts a survey of all its students. The survey is sent via email to all continuing students, asking them to rate their level of satisfaction with aspects of student life at Teachers College ranging from reactions to the admission process and financial aid to faculty availability, housing costs, quality of the library, among other issues. The response rate in 2005 was 30%. Once the data are compiled, a report is issued by the Office of Institutional Studies and sent to appropriate Deans so that proper steps can be taken to improve student satisfaction.

Some of the items are specific to the admission and financial aid processes, as reported in the table below. As can be seen, the trend over the last five years has been toward better student ratings of the admission/application process and the provision of college admission information. This confirms the results, discussed above, from the College’s annual New Admit Survey and the new OESS survey. However, student evaluations of the Office of Financial Aid have been fairly negative. To be sure, the Spring survey of Teachers College students found that they were reasonably happy with the availability of student loans, with ratings over the last five years averaging around 2.7, on a scale from 1 (Excellent) to 5 (Unsatisfactory). However, the students did not give a good rating to the availability of Teachers College student aid, with the ratings averaging around 3.6. Student ratings of the quality of the Office’s counseling on financing graduate school also averaged around 3.6. The Office of Financial Aid also had the highest number of negative responses among the various Enrollment and Student Services offices reviewed in the New Student Survey in 2004 and 2005, although that figure dropped from 37% in 2004 to 14% in 2005. The overall rating of the Office also improved dramatically (see Table 6.1), dropping from 3.01 to 2.23 in one year. This is a heartening result, suggesting that new staff appointments and efforts to improve the services provided by the Office of Financial Aid have been effective.

In addition, a study of complaints filed with the Office of Enrollment and Student Services during the 2004-05 academic year found that the Office of Financial Aid was the
leading source of complaints filed with the Manager of Student Advisement and Staff Development: of 223 student complaints, 67 involved complaints about the Office of Financial Aid.\(^2\) It should be noted, however, that the volume of complaints about Financial Aid was significantly lower in September, 2005, than in September 2004, suggesting significant improvements in the Office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings: 1 = excellent; 5 = unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2000-01</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2001-02</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2002-03</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2003-04</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2004-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admission/Application process</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College admissions information</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of Teachers College student aid</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of student loans</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling about financing graduate school</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of Program Decisions on Financial Aid

A Spring, 2005 survey of doctoral students at Teachers College addressed, among other things, student evaluations of the fairness with which Programs distributed scholarship points.\(^3\) Approximately 75% of those participating in the survey responded to this question, and of those responding only 45% rated the fairness of the scholarship distribution within their program or department to be excellent or good, while 27% rated it neutral and 28% as poor or unsatisfactory.\(^4\)

When asked about the fairness of the distribution of fellowships or assistantships by their program or department, only 40% of respondents rated it as excellent or good and 31% as poor or unsatisfactory. It should be noted that it can be difficult to separate students’ disappointment with the limited aid available from their evaluation of the process by which aid is awarded, but the response pattern nonetheless raises concerns that need to be addressed.

Conclusions

The Office of Admission has received largely positive evaluations from students for its efforts. Moreover, these evaluations have been improving in relation to the College’s competitor schools. Still, areas for further improvement in the College’s admissions efforts remain.

\(^2\)Complaints related to the Office of Financial Aid concerned a range of matters, including not only poor or unpleasant customer service, delay in processing student loans, and processing errors, but also dissatisfaction with the rules, policies or procedures that the Office of Financial Aid is responsible for administering.

\(^3\)The survey was answered by 693 students, 41% of those eligible, and was administered for the first time in Spring, 2005.

\(^4\)It might be that those who do not receive financial aid are predisposed to see the process as unfair. However, as 66% of the respondents to this item also indicated that they had received points, the manner in which academic programs distribute scholarship aid warrants closer review.
Evidence that the College’s matriculants are more affluent than the applicants suggests the importance of providing more need-based aid to enhance the socio-economic diversity of the entering class. An increase in merit-based aid is also needed for the College to attract the highly-qualified students it is now losing. Finally, while aggregate data are available on applicants’ and matriculants’ overall evaluation of the Office of Admission, data broken down by department or program would be useful. For example, do applicants feel more informed about certain Teachers College programs than about others?

The review of the data on the Office of Financial Aid and the financial aid system more generally reveals the importance of sustaining current efforts to improve its operations. Students expressed substantial dissatisfaction with how the office has operated in the past, though several measures indicated that satisfaction has increased greatly over the past year (2005). One source of earlier dissatisfaction involved the adequacy of information on available financial aid and financial aid processes. The Office’s website provides inadequate information on the whole range of financial aid available at Teachers College. Very little information is available on tuition discount aid, especially that distributed by the academic programs. Clearly, there is a significant amount of student dissatisfaction with the fairness of this aid distribution. No information has been given on scholarship support from extramurally-funded research projects and training grants, tuition exemption awarded to students on the basis of employment at the College, and Graduate Assistant funding. Information provided on endowed scholarships is brief and focused on College-wide rather than department- or program-specific scholarships.

**Student Services Offices within OESS**

**Office of the Registrar/Office of Doctoral Studies**

Core to the mission and responsibility of the Office of the Registrar is documenting students’ progress through the College, from the time they enter all the way through the alumnus stage. This main responsibility encompasses a broad range of activities covering several primary areas: student records, registration, catalogue review, doctoral studies, room assignments, and other academic services. Each area supports the academic mission of the College. Finally, as the main repository of student data, the Office of the Registrar prepares statistical reports for New York State and the federal government, and generates student information reports for other Teachers College departments and administrative offices.

**Student Records.** The area with the widest scope of services and activities is Student Records. The generation and maintenance of student records are a key service component related to all aspects of the College. This component entails the following:

- setting up and coordinating all necessary record-keeping systems for the collection and maintenance of all official academic student records. This includes but is not limited to the electronic student database, hard copy records, microfilm and microfiche records, and record systems for all supporting documentation systems.

- maintaining official academic records for all students who have ever attended Teachers College.
• grades: collecting grades from faculty; recording grades on student records; issuing
  grade reports to students; issuing final grade reports to instructors; reviewing and
  recording changes of grades in accordance with Faculty policy.

• degree audits: processing and recording degree awards (M.A., M.S., Ed.M., M.Phil.,
  Ed.D., and Ph.D.); reviewing all Master’s degree applications to insure completion of
  college degree requirements; completing final review of records for doctoral degree
  awards; issuing diplomas for all degrees except M.Phil. and Ph.D.; advising students
  of College degree requirements; and, preparing names for Commencement mailings
  and programs.

• maintaining records for other official academic history items—academic dismissals,
  teacher certification recommendations, student teaching hours, and so on.

• recording admission information on student records, including initial admission status
  with degree and major, and all changes in status for readmission or admission to
  another degree and/or major.

• insuring the security and integrity of all student records.

• issuing transcripts for all students who have ever attended Teachers College.

• issuing all statements verifying a student’s (current or former) academic status.

Registration. Another primary area of responsibility for the Office of the Registrar is
registration, which entails the following:

• setting up systems and processes for registration, including in-person registration,
  online registration via telephone and web, cross-registration with affiliated
  institutions (Columbia University, Barnard College, Jewish Theological Seminary,
  Union Theological Seminary, and the Inter-University Doctoral Consortium schools).

• assigning rooms for classes and all other uses in the College to support its academic
  mission.

• maintaining a file of all courses offered at Teachers College.

• assessing fees for all registrations.

• completing the exchange of fees with affiliated institutions.

• processing and approving Certificates of Equivalency for current students. (A
  Certificate of Equivalency is given to a student who is eligible for a different status,
  half-time or full-time, than would be obtained from course registration alone.)

Academic Catalog. The preparation of the academic catalog is now under the domain of
the Office of the Registrar. The catalog is reviewed for accuracy and clarity of information on
academic departments, degree and academic requirements, course listings, and academic and
administrative policies and procedures. Also, the Office ensures that the catalog is consistent
with the student handbook and doctoral requirements bulletins.
Office of Doctoral Studies. The Office of Registrar now includes the Office of Doctoral Studies, which maintains doctoral records to chart the progress of doctoral students; administers, coordinates, and records completion of each student’s doctoral requirements; and advises students on doctoral requirements and procedures. The Office also assists the Dean of the College, and several standing doctoral committees, in the administration of faculty policies regarding all Doctor of Education and Doctor of Philosophy degrees.

Evaluations. The Office of the Registrar generally receives good ratings of its procedures in the Student Satisfaction Survey. Over five years, the average rating of the quality of registration procedures was 2.2, on a scale from 1 (excellent) to 5 (unsatisfactory). Similar ratings were given for timeliness of receiving grades, production of transcripts, and usefulness of the College Catalog (see table below). The results of the New Student Survey show that the percentage of students responding positively to registration procedures increased from 70% to 78% between 2004 and 2005.

Table 6.8. Student Satisfaction with Office of Registrar Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings: 1 = excellent; 5 = unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2000-01</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2001-02</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2002-03</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2003-04</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2004-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration procedures</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of getting grades</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of transcripts</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of College Catalog</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of student complaints addressed by the Office of Enrollment and Student Services in 2004-05 found that 24 (10%) of these complaints involved the Registrar’s Office, a considerably lower figure than the number involving, for example, the Office of Financial Aid.\(^5\)

On the other hand, the Office of Doctoral Studies has received somewhat greater criticism. In the Spring, 2005 survey of doctoral students mentioned above, 438 out of 693 respondents to the survey reported using the service of the Office of Doctoral Studies. With regard to their general experience, only 50% of the respondents rated it as good or excellent, and 16% rated it as poor or unsatisfactory (with the remainder rating neutral). The average rating was 2.7, on a scale from 1 (excellent) to 5 (unsatisfactory). With regard to information provided by the Office, 55% rated it as good or excellent and 18% as poor or unsatisfactory; average rating was 2.55. While the Office of Doctoral Studies seemed to be receiving somewhat poorer ratings than the other sections of the Office of the Registrar, it should be noted that the population for the survey of doctoral students was only a subset of those surveyed on the Student Satisfaction Survey. Open-ended responses suggested that some students felt the staff—particularly those working with Ed.D.

---

\(^5\)The complaints ranged across a wide variety of issues from several dimensions of poor or unpleasant customer service and delays in processing important transactions, to dissatisfaction or disagreement with institutional regulations that are enforced by either the Office of the Registrar or the Office of Doctoral Studies. Additional information on the pattern of complaints is available from OESS.
versus Ph.D. students—was not as friendly or helpful as could be, and that information needed to
be more readily available and helpful (i.e., providing more examples rather than a simple statement
of rules and aligning better with the requirements of specific programs).

In addition to the issue of treatment of students in the Office of Doctoral Studies, other
issues on the nature of the rules the Office administers were raised. In the estimation of key
administrators and many faculty members, policies governing certification exam requirements,
requirements for continuous registration, requirement to complete at least 21 credits post-
certification, period of candidacy, and so forth need to be overhauled. Particularly needed was a
time limit from time of admission to certification. At present, the only time limit for post-
certification is the period of candidacy.

Conclusions. While the core of some problems experienced with services provided by
these areas can be attributed to dissatisfaction with the policies and the requirements that the
offices are required to enforce, and the disconnects between some of those policies and the
changing needs and practices within individual programs (e.g., doctoral certification exam formats,
period of candidacy extensions, etc.), there is evident need for service improvement. During the
Spring 2006 term, the Office of Doctoral Studies and the Office of the Registrar will undergo a
formal review of staffing, service, and operations. The goal of the review is to improve services to
students and outcomes of the review may involve the realignment of job responsibilities and the
clarification of position descriptions, as well as the reorganization of work processes.

Student Activities and Programs

The Office of Student Activities and Programs (OASP) enriches the students’ overall
educational experience by sponsoring a variety of campus-wide social, cultural, academic, and
professional programs. The Office offers support and advisement for all student organizations
recognized at Teachers College, leadership training workshops, weekly social activities, and
opportunities for students and faculty to interact beyond the classroom. More specifically, the
Office:

- coordinates the College-wide New Student Experience (Orientation). The Office
  sponsors comprehensive orientation programs and events for all new students in both
  the Fall and Spring semesters. These programs and events include tours, workshops,
  interactive educational sessions, social and community-building programs, academic
  advising, and opportunities to explore Columbia University and the surrounding
  neighborhoods.

- produces several student publications such as the student handbook and distributes
  weekly announcements to the general student body.

- advises and supports 30-35 student organizations. Students can participate in over 30
  student organizations, which provide opportunities for networking with all members of
  the College community. The composition of student organizations varies from special
  interest groups to local chapters of national organizations. The Office manages an
  organizational budget and addresses matters of programming and campus resources.
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sponsors a wide variety of student activities, including Casual Conversations, academic programming, and cultural events and activities (e.g., Black History Month, Chinese New Year), both on its own and in cooperation with other offices such as Residential Services, Safety and Security, and Diversity and Community.

Graduate Writing Center. The Graduate Writing Center provides discipline-specific, individualized, professional development to Teachers College students. The emphasis is on preparing graduate students to be more successful writers, both within their disciplines and in their publishing communities. More specifically, the Center offers both one-on-one private fee-based tutoring and workshops (both group and individual). The private tutoring teaches writing strategies but does not engage in editing or proofreading. The Center tutored 120 students in the Fall, 2004, semester (with each student averaging 10 hours of tutoring) and 85 students in the Spring, 2005, semester (with each student averaging 20 hours of tutoring). Writing workshops are devoted to such topics as dissertation writing, grant writing, advanced grammar for graduate students, APA referencing, and so forth. The Center sponsored 14 workshops in Fall, 2004, with an average attendance of about 6 students, and it sponsored 11 workshops in Spring, 2005, with average attendance of about 5 students.

The ratio between native and non-native speakers of English population who utilize the Graduate Writing Center has become more balanced. In the 2004-05 academic year, the native/non-native distribution was approximately 45% to 55%, respectively. The Center predominantly serves Master’s-level students, but a significant number of doctoral students do utilize the Center.

There are plans for ongoing evaluation of the Writing Center. A survey will be developed and implemented in Fall, 2006, to assess client satisfaction and determine future directions.

Insurance and Immunization Records. The Office of Student Activities and Programs is responsible for the following health insurance and immunization records services:

- notifying students of New York State and Teachers College immunization requirements;
- gathering and maintaining student immunization records;
- managing enrollment, assessing fees, and providing administrative support for health service and insurance programs; and
- providing students with information relative to immunizations, health services at Columbia, and the Columbia Student Medical Insurance Plans.

Aquatic Center. The Aquatic Center is open to all Teachers College and Columbia University students and faculty as well as area neighbors. A registration fee is charged to use the facility. The Aquatic Center provides training in swimming, CPR, first aid, and lifeguard training, and offers times for adult lap and family swimming. The Director is an American Red Cross Certified Instructor and certified personal trainer, lifeguard instructor, and CPR and First Aid instructor.
Evaluations. The Office of Student Activities and Programs receives fairly positive ratings from students for some of its activities. The mean ranking for the Office as a whole improved from 2.25 to 1.87, from the 2004 to the 2005 New Student Survey (see Table 6.1). The results of the Student Satisfaction Survey indicate that over the last five years, student orientation has been steadily improving, with the rating improving from 2.9 to 2.6 (see Table 6.9). This trend may actually understate the improvement in orientation in recent years, as many students completing it came to Teachers College before improvements were made. The Fall 2004 and 2005 New Student Surveys asked many questions about orientation (see Appendix C), including the check-in process, medical insurance and immunization requirements, and various information sessions offered. In 2005, 25 different parts of the orientation were evaluated—all rated positively, with mean scores ranging from 1.4 to 2.4. A recent survey of the Aquatic Center found that of 83 respondents, 60% rated its service as consistently high quality and 34% as generally excellent. To date, a comprehensive evaluation of the programs and services offered through the Graduate Writing Center has not been conducted, although one is under development with Fall, 2006, targeted for administration of the survey.

Table 6.9. Student Satisfaction with Orientation Activities of the Office of Student Activities and Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings: 1 = excellent; 5 = unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2000-01</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2001-02</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2002-03</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2003-04</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2004-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College orientation program</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions. While the Office of Student Activities and Programs has received positive feedback on a limited range of its offerings, a more comprehensive and systematic evaluation is needed of this Office as well as the full range of services, activities, and programs it sponsors. Plans are in motion for an evaluation of the Graduate Writing Center, and comparable evaluations of other OSAP activities such as its advising and support of student organizations and the student activities that it sponsors alone and with other College offices. Additionally, the Aquatic Center survey needs to be repeated, with care taken to assure a larger number of respondents.

Student Senate

The Student Senate serves as the representative of and liaison to the Teachers College student body. It works to gather and express student opinion and serves an essential communication role with students on College-wide issues. In addition to an Executive Board, departmental representatives, and representatives to the Columbia Student Senate, the Teachers College Senate includes standing committees for academic affairs, student life, institutional affairs, financial aid, community life, diversity, student organization, and special projects.

The Student Senate provides funding for student organizations to hold social events, both College-wide and departmentally, to help foster community. The Senate works with the Trustees, administration, faculty, and alumni on issues that impact the student experience at the College. For example, a member of the Student Senate has sat on the Steering Committees of the Teachers College Strategic Planning effort and of the Middle States accreditation effort.
Evaluation. No formal evaluation of the Student Senate has been conducted as of yet. Anecdotally, the Senate has engaged in a very effective rebuilding initiative, and currently is more effectively representing student interests at the College. As illustration, the Student Senate has recently succeeded in having representatives placed on most College-wide committees, including the Strategic Planning Committee and the Steering Committee for the Middle States re-accreditation. It also played an important role in creating the position of Associate Dean for Enrollment and Student Services. The Student Senate secured a voting member on the Columbia University Student Senate and worked with the Admission Office to make recommendations for improvements in the new student orientation program that were incorporated into the Admitted Student Weekend. Finally, it worked with the Office of Residential Services to conduct focus groups on student housing and improve the experience of students moving into student housing.

Conclusions. With its successful revitalization over the past three years, it would be appropriate at this juncture to undertake a more systematic evaluation of the Student Senate. An initial phase of this evaluation will be incorporated into the Spring, 2006, student satisfaction survey.

Office of International Services

Teachers College has a long history of welcoming international students, scholars, and faculty to our academic and social community. The mission of the Office of International Services (OIS) is to assist these individuals in reaching their academic/professional goals and in gaining the best possible value out of their U.S. experience. In addition, OIS strives to raise awareness in all College constituencies of the importance of intercultural educational exchange and the contributions of the international population to the Teachers College community.

Currently, approximately 600 students from over 70 countries are enrolled at all degree levels and in every department. The Office of International Services provides orientation and intercultural programs throughout the year; information on responsibilities, benefits, and options under immigration laws and regulations; and counseling on personal, financial, cultural, academic, and other concerns. In addition, OIS provides visa and orientation services for international visiting scholars; visa services for nonimmigrant faculty and staff; and resources for delegations of international visitors. The Office of International Services also sponsors campus-wide international awareness events and consults across the College on compliance with government regulations and other international issues and concerns.

Evaluation. The Office of International Services received 73% positive responses on the Fall 2004 New Student Survey, increasing to 88% in 2005. However, evaluations of specific services provided by OIS are needed.

Office of Access and Services for Individuals with Disabilities

The Office of Access and Services for Individuals with Disabilities (OASID) supports the College’s missions of equity and social justice by ensuring equal access through the provision of a wide range of individualized services for persons with varying disabilities. These individuals include students, faculty, staff, alumni, and other visitors with disabilities. Currently, 416 individuals with disabilities are registered with the Office.
Beginning in 1994, Teachers College developed a long-term goal of attracting and supporting individuals with disabilities to the Teachers College community. This goal included three objectives: removing barriers as per statutory requirements; increasing enrollment of students with disabilities in higher education; and acknowledging and celebrating this specific aspect of diversity as part of the mission of the College.

The first step in meeting these objectives was the institution of a professionally-staffed office; the development of policies and procedures that would provide consistent responses to equal access issues; and the allocation of appropriate resources for the provision of related support services.

The second was to develop a prioritized list of specific barrier removals. Many of these were architectural, such as the installation of an exterior ramp to Main Hall, internal wheelchair lifts between Main and Macy Halls, and a wheelchair lift to the stage of the Horace Mann Auditorium. However, barrier removal also included the installation of clear, useful, and code-compliant signage throughout the campus, and the “way-finding” project which produced maps of accessible routes throughout the campus in a variety of formats for individuals with different disabilities.

The third step was to establish an adaptive technology lab to provide equal access to campus computing for individuals with disabilities. The adaptive technology program also included laptop computers to expand the use of adaptive technology throughout the campus. In addition, an alternative text production program was initiated. Since 2000, OASID has steadily increased in text conversion capacity to provide students with accessible, alternative formats of readings required for academic programming at the College. To meet increasing needs, OASID has expanded the conversion system to include a high-speed full duplex scanner, a variety of related software, and a number of portable reading devices. In addition, OASID has established a post-production closed-captioning program, which permits conversion of older, inaccessible videos into accessible videos. Finally, in partnership with the College’s Computing and Information Services Office, OASID has invested in web-authoring tools and other relevant software to assist web developers in producing sites that are equally accessible. OASID has also begun to deploy some specific adaptive technology throughout the general computer labs on campus.

OASID offers a variety of accommodations, services, and resources for those registered with it, most of which are provided by student employees. These services may include: campus orientation; assistance with registration and academic adjustments; classroom accommodations (which may include readers, note takers, research assistants, sign language interpreters, computer-assisted real-time captioning [CART]; testing accommodations); and adaptive technology.

In addition, the Office maintains a collection of materials on disability, the law, education, adaptive technology, and disability studies, as well as information on a variety of disability-related organizations on the local, state, and federal levels.

One of the more recent efforts to increase awareness of, understanding about, and sensitivity to disability issues has focused on establishing a strong partnership with faculty. The Director and staff of OASID are periodically invited to meet with different groups at the College (e.g., faculty meetings, Management Network, etc.) to discuss these issues and develop mutually-beneficial programming. These discussions have led to the development of an OASID section in
the Faculty Handbook for full-time professors and the instructional guide for adjunct professors; development of a uniform syllabus statement directing students to the Office to make requests for reasonable accommodations; and inclusion of disability-related research in departmental course offerings and research.

OASID has been an advocate for equal access to the physical plant and has consulted on all renovation and new construction projects to ensure adherence to accessibility. OASID has continuously maintained its cutting-edge deployment of adaptive technology on campus and has strategically increased adaptive technology as well.

The Director represents OASID on several key committees, including the Barrier Removal Committee, Committee for Community and Diversity, Affirmative Action Committee, Management Network, Space Committee, and Strategic Planning Committee. Finally, efforts to incorporate disability issues into the intellectual and social fabric of the College were undertaken through the development of specific disability-related events: a Deaf Awareness Program (three-day program), Disability Film Festival, performances, American Sign Language classes, and general information sessions.

Evaluation. From the above, the OASID has been clearly active on a wide variety of fronts. Moreover, it received a high number of positive responses on both the 2004 (66%) and 2005 (85%) New Student Surveys. However, while such data are heartening, ongoing evaluations of the quality of delivery of specific services provided by the Office are needed.

Office of Career Services

The mission of the Office of Career Services is “guiding all Teachers College students and alumni throughout the different phases of the career development process. Whether students or alumni are entering a new field, advancing within their current profession, or changing directions, the Office of Career Services will help them to identify and develop the skills and resources necessary for achieving their career goals.” Among the specific services provided by the Office are the following:

- Teachers College Career Services website: contains lists of online resources for all academic programs at Teachers College as well as tip sheets and templates for resumes, cover letters, interviewing, networking, etc.;
- career counseling;
- career connections programming series, including events that spotlights careers that Teachers College students/alumni may wish to explore;
- career fairs, including fairs for PreK-12 education, charter schools, and the not-for-profit/public service sector;
- campus collaborations: collaborating with the various offices of career services at Columbia University to cross-promote events and work together on events relevant for wider populations (e.g., Washington, DC Career Conference, Not-for-Profit/Public Service Career Week);
• online job postings and recruitment (MonsterTRAK): students and alumni can review internships and part-time and full-time opportunities; submit resumes and cover letters; and sign up for campus and employer site interviews;

• employer information sessions where employers discuss their organizations and employment opportunities with prospective candidates;

• alumni mentoring and career networking events, where students and alumni can speak with Teachers College alumni who are currently working within a variety of career fields;

• career development workshops (e.g., Job Search Workshop for International Students; Interviewing for Success; Seal the Deal: Negotiate Effectively for Salary and Benefits);

• resume, Curriculum Vitae, and cover letter review;

• mock interviews with a career counselor;

• credential file services (via Interfolio, Inc.): a centralized location for letters of reference and other pertinent materials for the job search and/or graduate school applications; and

• career services library and resource area: hard copy resources, directories, and subscriptions related to the job search.

Career Services uses surveys (e.g., Zoomerang) with students and alumni to identify their needs; meets with program and departmental staff and faculty to determine career services that will complement students’ academic studies; sponsors in-class presentations, events, job fairs, and programs to provide career education and employment opportunities; and conducts follow-up surveys to determine from students and alumni attending an event if it met their needs and what their recommendations are for future events.

Evaluation. The Office received a high number of positive responses on the New Student Survey in both 2004 (75%) and 2005 (77%). These numbers should be treated cautiously, however, as most students may not have had their most intensive interaction with the Office during their first month of enrollment at the College. In addition, the Office has received positive feedback from its own Career Services Satisfaction Survey. Currently, Career Services is conducting an extensive follow-up of the Class of 2005 to determine their employment status and needs as alumni for continued service.

At the same time, students have expressed considerable unhappiness with how the College as a whole assists them in refining their career goals and locating employment opportunities (see Table 6.10 below). These activities include but go beyond the role of the Office of Career Services and encompass as well the efforts of faculty and, among others, the Offices of Financial Aid and Human Resources. This suggests that the College needs to develop measures that distinguish the contribution of the Office of Career Services from that of other sources.
Table 6.10. Student Satisfaction with Teachers College Assistance in Career Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistance</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2000-01</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2001-02</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2002-03</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2003-04</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2004-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in refining career goals</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in locating employment</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions. Teachers College has improved its very negative ratings from five years ago in assisting students to refine their career goals and locate employment, but students are still not particularly happy. While a major part of the improvement may be due to improvements in the Office of Career Services, the College needs to continue improving its efforts. A key part of this improvement may be to strengthen the contribution of other parts of the College that impinge on students’ career development and job placement. To do this, it will be necessary to secure more differentiated measures of the various sources at the College contributing to career development and employment opportunities.

Student Support Services Housed outside the Office of Enrollment and Student Services

In addition to the units that are part of the Office of Enrollment and Student Services (OESS), important student service functions at the College are organized under different administrative areas.

Office of Diversity and Community

The Office of Diversity and Community (ODC) is part of the Office of the President. It was mandated by the President’s Diversity Taskforce Report of 1999. Since that time, the Office has worked to address, enhance, and invigorate Teachers College’s engagement with issues of diversity, community, and civility affecting students, staff, and faculty. Led by Janice Robinson, General Counsel and Director of ODC, the Office’s philosophy is to focus on systemic issues by addressing policies and procedures throughout the College with Teachers College’s policymakers. These issues can overlap with potential legal concerns (i.e., discrimination, due process, equity, and retaliation). In addition to heading the Office of Diversity and Community and serving as General Counsel, Robinson also chairs the President’s Committee for Community and Diversity. This is the College’s only standing cross-constituency committee which includes five student representatives.

The Office of Diversity and Community, with the assistance of faculty, staff, students, alumni, and administration, focuses its efforts on activities, projects, and funding to support work that enhances the College’s academic and working environments and culture; improves Teachers College-wide communications on multiple levels; continues positive Teachers College community interactions and activities; continues review of Diversity Task Force Report recommendations; and, finally, improves links between Teachers College and the surrounding external community.
The Office developed and implemented two College-wide grant programs for diversity and community projects/activities. These include: The President’s Grant Fund for Student Research in Diversity, which provides two doctoral students with $3,000 each and another one, two or three doctoral students with an honorable mention of a $1,000 grant. The funds support outstanding student research projects related to diversity. The President’s Grant for Diversity and Community Initiatives funds projects, programs, and events that benefit the entire Teachers College community, with the goal of encouraging community members to develop new and innovative ideas. As such, the Grant promotes interactive, inter-group communication as well as collaborative and educational activities, with an emphasis in community and/or diversity. In AY2004-05, 15 groups were provided with a total of $20,000.

The Office also sponsors programming at the College, which encourages collaboration with students, faculty, and staff to build community. In AY2004-05, the Office also supported 17 projects and community members with independent grants for their creative ideas enhancing diversity or community-building. These projects included: the Affirmative Action Committee’s Diversity Action Planning Committee; the African Ciné Club; Professors Christine Sleeter and Robin Kelly speaking at the Issues in Urban Education Lecture Series; and Professors Ofelia Garcia and Lesley Bartlett conducting workshops and day trips that brought Teachers College graduate students and high school Latino immigrant students together to learn about New York city neighborhoods.

The Office of Diversity and Community has produced and co-sponsored the following kinds of diversity and community related programs (not inclusive):

• Diversity awareness activities: for example, the Teachers College African Diaspora Ciné Club; Deaf Awareness Week; panel on Gay and Lesbian Educational and Legal Issues; Hispanic Heritage Month;

• Academic activities: for example, the Education Across the Americas Graduate Student Conference; the Center for African Education open house celebrating African Studies; Forum on Religious Education during Times of War;

• Community-building activities: for example, Teachers College community breakfasts and lunches for Teachers College Faculty and staff; the College Conversation Series with President Levine and Dean Bailey, which are opportunities for students and others to address issues with the President and the Dean in a large seminar setting; and

• Staff recognition activities: for example, Facilities Staff Appreciation Day.

Evaluations. No formal evaluations of the activities of the Office of Diversity and Community have been conducted. However, the activities of this Office are important and, by anecdotal report, have been effective in creating a more diverse and caring community on campus.

Conclusions. There is a need for systematic evaluation of the Office’s activities. In particular, more information is needed on which activities have been particularly effective. Moreover, are some activities more effective with certain kinds of constituents versus others (e.g., students versus faculty, one kind of student versus another)?
The Office of Residential Services reports to the Vice President of Finance and Administration. The professional staff of five consists of a Director, an Associate Director, an Assistant Director, and two Area Directors. The support staff consists of 6 full-time and 23 part-time positions.

The residence halls bring together graduate students from all over the world in an environment that offers a unique opportunity to establish new friendships, explore other world views, and take advantage of all that New York City offers. Living close to campus affords students easy access to the library, classrooms, gymnasium, and other Columbia University facilities. Students may choose to participate in a wide range of planned residence hall activities, club meetings, departmental lectures, and musical and dance events.

The Office of Residential Services aims to support the institutional mission of the College by providing campus housing that is convenient, safe, and reasonably priced for students, faculty, and staff. The Office is committed to providing a diverse graduate residential population with a stimulating, inclusive, and caring environment which enhances the out-of-classroom experience and leads to intellectual, personal, and professional growth.

Teachers College offers a variety of housing options for single and married students, students with domestic partners, and single parents. Approximately 650 units are available for single students and 150 apartments for families/domestic partners.

Housing offers are based on availability of rooms/apartments, geographic priority, and date of receipt of the completed housing application and fee. Applicants who live outside a 50-mile radius of Teachers College have the highest priority. The Office of Residential Services accepts applications up to a year before a student plans to begin studying at Teachers College.

Housing Demographics. For the academic year 2003-04, the Office of Residential Services received 1,379 housing applications for the Fall and 179 for the Spring. The Office provided housing for 223 students for Fall (leaving 296 on the waiting list) and 57 for Spring (leaving 40 on the waiting list). Housing demographics for academic year 2003-04 are given in Table 6.11 on the following page.

Housing Eligibility and Requirements. To be eligible for student housing, applicants must be enrolled in a degree program at Teachers College and registered for classes. To maintain eligibility, residents must be registered for a minimum of 24 points (or its equivalent) during a 12-month period beginning with the Fall semester. If equivalency is needed, residents must have an approved Certificate of Equivalency (COE) on file with the Office of the Registrar.

Residents who register for 24 credits (or its equivalent) during the Fall and Spring semesters combined (or 12 credits during the Spring semester for students who begin residency in the Spring) are not required to register for Summer sessions and may remain in the residence hall, but must re-enroll and live in Teachers College housing for the upcoming Fall semester.
Students living in Teachers College residence halls are also required to enroll in Health Services at Columbia University and either enroll in the Columbia Student Medical Insurance Plan or carry a comparable alternate insurance plan.

Table 6.11. Background of Students in Teachers College Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proportion of Whole Teachers College Population</th>
<th>Proportion of Fall 2003 Residents</th>
<th>Proportion of Spring 2004 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino(a)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Origin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.-born</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: We have excluded foreign students as a category from the race-ethnicity base since students can be of any race-ethnic background.

Residents may remain in housing for the following periods of time, depending on their degree program: M.A. students, up to 2 years, including two Certificates of Equivalency (COEs); M.S./Ed.M. students, up to 3 years (including 3 COEs); and Ed.D./Ph.D. students, up to 5 years (including 3 COEs). Residents continuing in subsequent programs, changing programs or returning to Teachers College housing after a break in stay are entitled to the maximum number of years for the highest degree program for which they register (i.e., residents who use 2 years for an M.A. will have 1 additional year for an M.S. or Ed.M., and 3 additional years for an Ed.D. or Ph.D., while students who use 3 years for an M.S. or Ed.M. will have only 2 additional years for an Ed.D. or Ph.D.).

**Residential Services.** The Residential Services program at Teachers College focuses on community development and educational and social programming that provides students with an opportunity to explore values and social relationships. For academic year 2003-04, the Office of Residential Services implemented 137 events in the following categories: Educational, 16; Community Service, 5; Cultural, 15; Social, 75; Physical, 6; and General Information Sessions, 20.

To assist with this aspect of on-campus living, the Office of Residential Services employs 18 graduate assistants. Three of them serve as Complex Directors and supervise 15 Community Assistants. These staff members plan a variety of programs and events throughout the year and assist with counseling and referrals as needed.

**Other Services.** Other services provided by the Office of Residential Services include: off-campus housing listings, guest room short-term rentals, summer conference housing,
campus-wide programs and events, faculty and staff housing, and new resident orientation. The Office of Residential Services is committed to assisting incoming and matriculated students in securing affordable, adequate off-campus housing. Throughout the Summer, the Office conducts weekly information sessions for interested students. These sessions are designed to provide new students with strategies and resources they can utilize to successfully complete a search for an off-campus apartment.

Evaluation. The Spring, 2005, survey of student satisfaction indicates that over the last five years, students have not been very happy with the availability of student housing. However, student satisfaction rather sharply increased in the last year (see Table 6.12). This is almost certainly attributable to the increase in the number of units available with the opening of a new residence on 121st Street.

Table 6.12. Student Satisfaction with Office of Residence Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings: 1 = excellent; 5 = unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2000-01</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2001-02</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2002-03</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2003-04</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2004-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Availability of student housing</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Office of Residential Services also conducts regular student satisfaction surveys (“Quality of Life Survey”) and exit interviews. Table 6.13 below summarizes selected results from the 2003 and 2004 surveys. The first survey was answered by 43% of the residents and the second by 33%. The surveys ask opinions of such topics as whether or not the residence hall provides a welcoming environment; the atmosphere of the residence hall is supportive of residents from different cultures; the residence director is available or approachable; programs presented by the Office are offered at a convenient time; the residence hall is a safe environment; the facilities are cleaned regularly, and so forth.

The surveys indicated that, for the most part, residential students are happy with their residential life experience. About three-quarters are satisfied with their overall experience and would recommend living in Teachers College housing to an incoming student. Particularly important is that more than three-quarters of the respondents say they find their residence hall provides a welcoming experience and a supportive atmosphere for students from different cultures. (It is worth noting the slight increase between 2003 and 2004 in the number disagreeing with the latter two statements; however, this could be the result of sampling variation, especially since the 2004 sample was smaller than the 2003 one.) The main areas of substantial complaint concerned conduciveness to studying (30-40% did not find this); reasonable price (half did not find this); cleanliness of community kitchen equipment (half complained); and satisfaction with laundry room facilities (half complained).
Table 6.13. Office of Residential Services Quality of Life Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my overall residence hall experience.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend living in Teachers College housing to an incoming student.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My room/apartment is reasonably priced.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My residence hall provides a welcoming environment.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The atmosphere in my residence hall is supportive of residents from different cultures.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The atmosphere in my residence hall is conducive to studying.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My residence hall is a safe environment.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Office of Housing and Residence Life staff members are courteous and helpful.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am knowledgeable about residence hall policies and procedures.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would be very useful to disaggregate these overall results by student characteristics such as gender, race-ethnicity, and national origin. Despite the good overall results, pockets of students may have considerably less favorable opinions.

Conclusions. The Office of Residential Services has been able to create a diverse residential body and plan programs and events that support the mission of College. Over 75% of on-campus residents rate the Office as creating an atmosphere open to diversity and would recommend Teachers College housing to others. However, the existing housing stock is old, with an average age (excluding the new residence hall) of 98 years, over which time renovations
have taken place. But to remain competitive in attracting students, the College needs to consider investing more in residential facilities.

Office of Campus Safety and Security

The Office of Safety and Security (Teachers College Security) is also under the Vice President for Finance and Administration. The Office is staffed 24 hours a day by security officers who are certified by the State of New York and who work closely with other neighborhood security departments and enforcement agencies. Campus Safety and Security, with 28 uniformed officers, is managed by the Chief of Safety and Security, an Assistant Director, and a Tour Manager.

The mission of the Office of Campus Safety and Security at Teachers College is to protect College property and to insure that students, Faculty, staff, and visitors are able to use Teachers College buildings and property without fear or interruption. The Office has the following goals:

- maintain order and facilitate an atmosphere of peace and security;
- enforce all laws, statutes, rules, and regulations to ensure the safety of University Faculty, staff, students, and visitors;
- maximize campus safety and minimize security risk factors;
- educate the College community, including faculty, staff, and students, on crime prevention methods and techniques, and encourage them to accept appropriate responsibility for their safety and security on campus;
- impartially support and vigorously protect the rights of individuals and groups;
- provide “client-oriented” services to all segments of the University community; and
- encourage and provide professional development opportunities for the Office of Safety and Security staff.

The jurisdiction for the Office includes all property owned or leased by Teachers College. The desk at Whittier Hall serves as the central point of contact and coordination for the department. The campus employs many state-of-the-art physical security features, including digital CCTV and card readers.

The Office is also responsible for issuing and managing the Teachers College identification card program (Teachers College Card). All students, faculty, staff, visiting professors/scholars, and alumni are eligible to receive a Teachers College Card. Currently, over 10,000 active Teachers College Cards are in the system.
Crime Prevention Programs. The Office of Campus Safety and Security offers the following services to students in an effort to accomplish a continuous reduction of crime by implementing proactive programs and policies and working with the security departments of neighboring institutions:

- **Crime awareness programs:** The Office conducts a variety of programs such as Campus Safety Week.

- **Operation ID:** Encourages and provides assistance to conspicuously marking each item of personal property with a unique identifier. Engravers are available at the Teachers College Office of Campus Safety and Security.

- **Preventing bicycle theft:** The latest F.B.I. statistics indicate that bicycle theft is on the rise nationwide. Bicycles registered with Teachers College Security will also be registered with the NYPD. The Office also makes antitheft devices—Kryptonite Bike Locks, “The Club,” “The Shield,” “LO-JACK Anti-Theft Devices”—available at a reduced cost.

- **Preventing car theft:** The Office makes available a variety of procedures to prevent automobile theft. One is Auto V.I.N. Etching, in which the vehicle identification number is etched on a car window. In the Combat Auto Theft procedure, a decal is affixed to the rear side window of a car indicating that it is not normally driven between the hours of 1 a.m. and 5 a.m., so the car should be stopped if seen at those hours. A related device is Commuter C.A.T. for cars that are normally not operated during the hours of 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. Finally, the H.E.A.T. (Help End Auto Theft) program (covering 24 hours) is designed for vehicle owners over the age of 40 years. If the police observe anyone under the age of 25 years old driving a car with this decal, it should be stopped.

**Evaluation.** No evaluation of the operations of the Office of Campus Safety and Security have been conducted.

**Conclusions.** The Office of Safety and Security has been active with a variety of programs and there is a great need for their evaluation. The post-September 11 world has heightened people’s concerns about security. Yet security efforts are always in tension with efforts to maintain an open and welcoming campus and avoid racial and ethnic stigmatization. It is important to learn—from the perspectives of the varied constituents of the College—how well the Office has balanced these two goals.

**Office of Student Accounts**

The Office of Student Accounts provides a range of services to students, faculty, and staff of Teachers College. The services include responding to inquiries regarding tuition, housing, and other accounts receivable; billing for and collecting tuition, housing, and other applicable fees; and disbursing federal, private, and institutional aid, stipends, and refund checks. In addition, the Office of Student Accounts makes deferred payment arrangements with students who cannot make full payment. Staff of the Office of Student Accounts also process all
payments from students and staff for tuition, housing, and loan accounts and serve a key role in the resolution of any account discrepancies.

The Office of Student Accounts has responsibility for the disbursement of federal and institutionally administered loan funds, and is a key partner with the Office of Financial Aid.

**Evaluation.** Responses to the annual Spring survey of student satisfaction place student satisfaction with billing and fee payment procedures roughly on par with other front-line student services. The average rating on a scale from 1 to 5 has been 2.4 (see Table 6.14 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings: 1 = excellent; 5 = unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2000-01</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2001-02</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2002-03</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2003-04</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2004-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billing and fee payment procedures</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions.** The Office’s activities clearly go beyond billing and fee payment procedures. Given the importance of the collaborative relationship between Financial Aid and Accounts Receivable, it would be useful to have a wider-ranging evaluation of the Office of Accounts Receivable as a companion assessment to a more comprehensive evaluation of the Office of Financial Aid.

**Computing and Information Services**

The Computing and Information Services department is responsible for support of technology for faculty, staff, student and administrative functions (see Standards 4 & 5 for the full scope of its activities). Through its Academic Computing Services group, it supports students through the provision of Columbia University email accounts and network access, the ClassWeb course management system, computer labs, workshops and training sessions, individual assistance for statistical and other software for research, and remote access from student residence halls and from off-campus. Academic Computing Services also provides physical (computer classrooms and mobile laptops) and virtual computing environments (servers for student projects) for particular courses.

TC ClassWeb is a College-wide, user-friendly course environment. Instructor and enrollment information for all credit courses in the schedule of classes is refreshed nightly. ClassWeb provides the typical array of course management system functions, from syllabi, to threaded discussions to file sharing and email. It is found within MyTC Portal, which provides College-wide announcements, student and faculty profiles, and collaborative tools for groups based on affinities other than class membership. The library has implemented electronic reserves integrated with ClassWeb, as well as electronic document delivery. A pro-active faculty training effort for ClassWeb includes email to all instructors prior to each semester, announcing system enhancements and the schedule of workshops on its use.

The computer labs include general labs (with PCs and Macs which are replaced on a two-year cycle where students do word processing, access email and the Internet, and work with a
range of programs from Dreamweaver to Endnote to SPSS) and special purpose labs designed for individual projects or departmental use (e.g., the Instructional Media Lab, the iDesign Lab).

Computing and Information Services also offers 2-6 hour classes on a wide variety of applications (see http://www.tc.columbia.edu/i/a/2846_Spring2006b.pdf for the current schedule). Individual consulting is also available to students for both high-end and low-end applications of technology.

**Feedback and Evaluation.** Computing and Information Services has used focus groups with students and instructors as well as online and hard copy surveys to elicit feedback on the course management system since it was first implemented across all courses in 1997. One of the most consistent comments from students has been that they would like more faculty to use it. The response has been to provide multiple means for acquainting instructors with ClassWeb and assisting them in its use. The discussion feature was replaced in response to user feedback. In the Fall 2004 survey over 70% of students reported a positive or very positive overall experience with ClassWeb. A large majority of respondents (73%) said that the online syllabus improved course management and learning; 64% had a similar evaluation for electronic reserves; and, 45% rated file-sharing functionality as improving course management and learning.

Computing and Information Services also conducts an annual survey of students. Examples of feedback that have been used to improve responsiveness include changing the recruitment and training of lab consultants, decreasing the charge for pages printed, and revising the workshop schedule to include more special applications and less basic instruction in word processors and spreadsheets. In 2003, the survey asked where students might use wireless networking on campus. With over 40% responding that they would use it in classrooms as well as public spaces, the project was accelerated. In 2005, coverage of all academic buildings with wireless network access was completed, in addition to the public spaces in the dormitories. In 2004, there was a positive correlation between students reporting trouble with accessing ClassWeb from off-campus and using dial-up connections. Consequently, students are being advised that about 90% use broadband and have better experience than those who do not.

The annual student survey also asks for satisfaction ratings of various computer services and measures the amount of use that these services are getting. In general, use of the services has grown substantially over the past decade. While under one-third of the students were using email for coursework in 1994, nearly 90% are doing so, according to the most recent survey. Overall satisfaction trends show improvement (see Table 6.15a). In 2004-05, the overall question was not asked. The specific service ratings were rated on a 4-point scale, with sample results as shown in Table 6.15b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings: 1 = excellent; 5 = unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2000-01</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2001-02</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2002-03</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2003-04</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2004-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Not asked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.15b. 2004-05 Student Satisfaction with Computing and Information Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Mean Rating 2004-05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC public workstations</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia email</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC Web</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology workshops</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web registration and credit card payment</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions. Computing and Information Services makes regular use of student and faculty feedback in improving services. Though overall satisfaction with its services is fairly good and improving, it would be interesting to know if perceptions differ among students from different backgrounds, particularly part-time students and students of color.

Complaints and Grievances

The College is in the process of reviewing its student grievance policy and procedures. A key part of this is a new policy concerning Complaints and Grievances. A draft of a new policy, prepared by the Student Conduct Committee, is still under review. In addition, the various offices that have handled grievances are trying to clarify who will handle which grievance and what procedures will be followed.

Who Handles Grievances and How. At one time or another, every operation of the College will almost inevitably result in a student grievance. The vast majority are handled informally, with the student dealing directly with the office or faculty member with whom there is a grievance. However, at some point, informal resolution does not work, and grievances then move to more formal action.

Any formal complaints or grievances filed by a student under either the College’s Harassment Policy or the Academic Misconduct Policy are referred to the Associate Dean for Academic Administration, William Baldwin. Outside of complaints in those two specific categories, a number of other offices play a role in handling student grievances, including the Office of Enrollment and Student Services, the Office of Residential Services, the Student Ombudsman, the Dean and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and even the President of the College.

(1) Office of Associate Dean for Academic Administration. This Office handles complaints involving academic issues and allegations of harassment or assault. Academic issues are related to faculty, courses, grades, and certification exams, including advisement, cheating, and plagiarism. Complaints alleging harassment or assault based on gender, race, ethnicity, age, and sexual orientation fall under the College’s Harassment Policy, and initial inquiries should go to the Office of the Associate Dean for Academic Administration.
It is recommended that student grievances begin with the person against whom the grievance is being made. If the issue involves the instructor of a course, the grievance is with the instructor, whom the student should contact first in an attempt to resolve the grievance. If the grievance is not resolved at the instructor level, the student should schedule an appointment with the program coordinator, the second level for the review of grievances. If the grievance is not resolved at the program coordinator level, the third level of appeal is the departmental chairperson. The departmental chairperson, at his or her discretion, may call a meeting of the instructor, the program coordinator, and the student. If resolution of the grievance is achieved at either the second or third stage, the program director or chairperson, respectively, will send a memo to that effect to all involved.

If the student is uncomfortable working within the department, he or she may directly approach the Associate Dean for Academic Administration to request a meeting with members of the Student Conduct Committee. Constituting a grievance panel comprised of three faculty members and two students from the Student Conduct Committee will provide an alternate space for students to discuss and resolve grievances. The Associate Dean, in consultation with the Student Conduct Committee, is responsible for administering the student grievance and may, when appropriate, make recommendations for the resolution of student grievances. As a final stage in the process, the student may appeal the Student Conduct Committee’s recommended resolution to the President of the College. The President’s decision is final.

(2) Office of Associate Dean for Enrollment and Student Services. Student concerns or grievances which are non-academic but affect the student experience (including Residential Services and Student Accounts) can be brought to the Office of the Associate Dean for Enrollment and Student Services. Concerns alleging “bad behavior” by a student (e.g., someone who is rude, threatening, abusive)—as long as it is not an issue of “harassment” as defined in the Harassment Policy—would also come to this office.

Students are first expected to exhaust all resources available to them in the particular office under the OESS umbrella with which they are interacting. If further action is needed, the OESS Manager of Student Advisement and Staff Development meets individually with students on behalf of the Associate Dean. Student concerns are documented and follow-up measures are taken. The Manager of Student Advisement catalogs all student intakes in an electronic database so that policies and procedures may also be evaluated. The Manager consults with the Associate Dean on an as-needed basis, but often handles communication with students and other offices involved in students’ concerns as the Associate Dean’s designee. This intake process allows OESS in the short term to assist students with their concerns while educating them about options and resources at the College. In the long term, the student intake process allows OESS to identify policies and procedures that need to be addressed at an institutional level.

Students can also voice their concerns directly to the Associate Dean, during open office hours or town meetings. During the 2004-05 academic year, the Manager of Student Advisement met with 223 students.

(3) Office of Residential Services. When complaints arise concerning a housing-related issue, they are handled by either an Assistant Director or Area Director who is responsible for the area in which the complaint arose. Students may appeal the decision to the Director. The Director
in turn may refer the issue to the department’s Special Cases Committee for a recommendation. The Special Cases Committee is an ad hoc group chaired by the Assistant Director of Housing, with a core membership of the Director of Office of Access for Individuals with Disabilities and a representative from the Office of Enrollment and Student Services. Additional members such as the Director of International Student Services or the Director of Student Activities and Programs can be added as necessary. Complaints are always responded to in writing by an Assistant Director or the Director. Copies of the complaint and the response are kept in the student’s file.

Complaints filed about the Safety and Security Office are investigated and responded to by the manager of the area in which the complaint arises. All complaints are responded to in writing. If the complaint concerns the behavior of a member of the management team, then it is investigated by that manager’s supervisor. All complaints may be appealed to the Director and then to the Vice President for Finance and Administration.

(4) Student Ombuds Office. As an additional resource for students at Teachers College, the Ombudsman is charged with attempting to resolve informally student dissatisfaction of an academic nature as requested by a student or group of students. A student with an academic grievance is encouraged to deal directly with the instructional or administrative offices of the College most relevant to the matter. However, at any point in the consideration of a grievance, a student has the right to the assistance of the Ombudsman as a mediator in consultation with the instructional and administrative officers of the College.

According to the Ombudsman, Dr. Erwin Flaxman, the complaints that he has addressed fall mainly into these categories:

- Faculty (and staff) behavior, treatment of students, and quality of teaching, course, and program (includes faculty availability, consistency of course requirements, and interpersonal exchanges): 29%
- Non-doctoral faculty advisement and problems with student academic progress (e.g., incompletes): 25%
- Lack of regular and timely dissertation advisement and conflict over doctoral progress (includes dropping a student from a doctoral program because of assessment of student capacity to complete a doctoral program): 18%
- Faculty posting of a grade in a timely fashion and student-instructor disagreement about the fairness of the grade: 10%
- Financial Aid: 7%
- Housing and Security: 7%
- Disability Services: 4%

The Ombudsman is rarely the first person students come to deal with a complaint or resolve a conflict. Typically, students seek the help of the Ombudsman after they feel they are not able to resolve the problem with the faculty or staff member involved.
The main ways in which complaints are resolved are the following:

- First, the Ombudsman assists students in their efforts to directly resolve complaints or conflicts with a party or an office. The Ombudsman helps students find an approach to resolve the grievance or complaint. This includes informing them of relevant Teachers College policies and procedures, gathering information, and helping them frame an argument for their position or a reasonable appeal. Sometimes during discussion, the students decide they do not have a legitimate grievance and take the issue no further. In some instances, students indicate that they do not want any steps taken; rather, they wanted only to express their complaint or grievance in the hope that problems like theirs will be avoided or resolved in the future.

- The Ombudsman often calls and/or meets with the faculty or staff member in a College office to obtain more information or to clarify the problem. In some instances, the faculty or staff member, the students, and the Ombudsman meet to mediate the conflict or resolve the problem. If these efforts are not successful, the Ombudsman refers students to the Associate Dean for Academic Administration, the Associate Dean for Enrollment and Student Services or the Director of Residential Services for a resolution of the problem, which the Ombudsman again facilitates.

- When appropriate, the Ombudsman explains to students their rights and the procedures for dealing with sexual or racial harassment. In matters of racism or racial harassment, the Ombudsman deals with the problem directly and follows the procedures outlined above, although students still can file a formal complaint as outlined in the Harassment Policy. With regard to sexual harassment, the Ombudsman explains the policies and may refer students to a member of the Harassment Panel, if they so choose.

The Office of the Ombudsman is committed to solving students’ academic problems informally, whenever possible.

(5) Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean. If a student has attempted to resolve his or her complaint with the appropriate parties, including as appropriate the Associate Dean for Academic Administration or the Associate Dean for Enrollment and Student Services, but is not satisfied with the resolution of the complaint, he or she may bring the issue to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College, Darlyne Bailey, who will hear the issue.

(6) Office of the President. If a student has exhausted all policies and procedures in place for filing complaints and grievances and wishes to appeal the resolution of the complaint/grievance, the final appeal is to the Office of the President. At that point, Janice Robinson, General Counsel, in concert with the President of Teachers College, will make a final decision on the issue.

Evaluations. No formal evaluation of the College’s complaint and grievance procedures has been undertaken.

Conclusions. The College is taking major steps to clarify and streamline its process for handling grievances. A major part of this is the development of the Statement of Student Grievance Policy and Procedures. However, much remains to be worked out, including the need...
to further clarify where grievances should go once they cannot be resolved by the initial office to which they are addressed. In particular, it is still not entirely clear where grievances arising with the Offices of Residential Services and Student Accounts should go if they cannot be resolved by those offices. Furthermore, the role of the College Ombudsman is still unclear in the emerging structure. Is this an office for first disposition or for hearing appeals after the first disposition? In addition, there does not seem to be any central system for recording and tracking the progress of grievances across the various offices that deal with them. Finally, a thorough evaluation is needed of the complaint and grievance process, both before and after further reforms. In particular, much more information is necessary on the nature of student complaints and how students—varying in the nature of their complaint, their location within the College, and their background—feel about how well those complaints are handled.

Information Usage

The College is required to follow the requirements of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) in the storage and release of all student records that it maintains.6

The Registrar’s Office requires the student’s written permission to release information. Exceptions are made for internal use and release of “directory information” (name, mailing and permanent address, photo, email address, major field of study, dates of attendance at the College, degrees conferred and their dates). However, a student can ask the Registrar to not release such information.

The Registrar has begun offering presentations on FERPA requirements for various audiences, including the Office of Human Resources at its orientation program for new staff; the Office of Enrollment and Student Services; and adjunct faculty in the Fall term. In addition, the Registrar has been planning to conduct College-wide FERPA training and instituting a Web tutorial regarding FERPA regulations for all new hires. The web-based tutorial would be developed to provide training on compliance with the Gramm-Leech-Bliley regulations as well.7 The College has also established an Information Privacy Compliance Training Subcommittee of the Professional Development Committee, headed by Janice Robinson, General Counsel. One of the Subcommittee’s charges is to provide comprehensive training procedures for all staff about privacy of information, including FERPA and other compliance issues under Gramm-Leach-Bliley.

Evaluation. There is no evaluation process for College-wide compliance with FERPA. The Federal Policy Compliance Office (FPCO)—the federal agency responsible for overseeing FERPA—does not conduct audits or evaluations. While FPCO will investigate violations of FERPA if a complaint is filed with their office, there is no routine or periodic assessment of campus compliance with FERPA. There are no current records of FERPA complaints filed against the College.

Conclusions. The lack of student complaints about how the handling of their records is heartening. However, it would be useful for the College to conduct a formal evaluation, if only

---

6A copy of the FERPA rules as they apply to the College is included in Appendix VI.B
7Materials related to the Gramm-Leech-Bliley regulations will be available in the Resource Room during the site visit.
by asking students in the Spring satisfaction survey how well they think records have been handled. Faculty and staff may also have issues about the handling of records and thus should be surveyed as well.

Recommendations

In addressing standards related to admission and to student services, the review and discussion provided in this chapter also addressed three specific questions:

- How does the admissions process reflect the mission of the College?
- The College recently re-organized its Enrollment and Student Service Functions under one division: the Office of Enrollment and Student Services (OESS). Why was this done, and what are the early indications of the wisdom of this decision?
- What measures are in place to assess the continuing effectiveness of the OESS?

The recommendations that grew out of review and analysis of admission and student services are provided below, organized into three sections: admission and financial aid processes; other student services and offices within OESS; and student support services and offices organizationally housed outside of OESS.

Admission and Financial Aid Processes

- Provide more need-based aid to enhance the socio-economic diversity of entering classes.
- Provide more merit-based aid to attract the best students.
- Complete the review of current rubrics for allocating institutional scholarship funds to departments, and the criteria and processes by which academic departments recommend award of those funds, to assure that allocations are more effectively linked to enrollment goals, and criteria and processes assure a fair, consistent, and equitable use of scarce scholarship resources.
- While aggregate data are available on applicants’ and matriculants’ overall evaluations of the Office of Admission, it would be very useful to refine data collection to provide more robust analyses by department or program and by student background.
- Sustain current efforts to improve the operations of the Financial Aid Office. In particular, improve the Office’s website so that it provides adequate information on the whole range of financial aid available at Teachers College.

Student Services Offices within the OESS

- The Office of Doctoral Studies needs significant improvement in its relations with students and provision of information. At the same time, the College more generally needs to revamp the rules that the Office is asked to apply since those rules no longer fit well with the academic needs of students and faculty. One rule change that
particularly merits consideration is placing a time limit on the movement of Ed.D. students from matriculation to certification to graduation.

- Conduct more wide-ranging evaluations of the Office of Student Activities and Programs, the Student Senate, the Office of International Services, and the Office of Access and Services for Individuals with Disabilities.

- Develop more differentiated measures of the various sources at the College contributing to career development and employment opportunities, allowing a clearer picture of the contributions of the Office of Career Services alone and of other parts of the College.

**Student Support Services Housed Outside the OESS**

- Systematically evaluate the activities sponsored by the Office of Diversity and Community. Are some activities more effective with certain kinds of constituencies versus other constituencies (e.g., students versus faculty, one kind of student versus another)?

- Disaggregate the results of the Student Residential Services Quality of Life Survey and the Computing Services Survey by student characteristics such as gender, race-ethnicity, and national origin.

- The College has recently completed a new student residence hall, an accomplishment that highlights the need for substantial investments in the renovation and refurbishment of the College’s older residential facilities.

- Have more comprehensive, systematic evaluation of the Office of Campus Safety and Security, the Office of Student Accounts, the College’s complaint and grievances procedures, and the College’s handling of student records.

- While there have been important improvements in grievance and complaint resolution systems, they can still be perceived as unnecessarily complex and confusing, particularly as the content of a complaint or grievance crosses different administrative, academic or residential life boundaries. More work needs to be done to further clarify complaint and grievance resolution systems, particularly where complaints and grievances should be directed once they cannot be resolved by the initial office to which they are addressed. Clarify the role of the Ombudsman in the emerging structure of complaint and grievance processing.
APPENDIX VI. A

DRAFT STATEMENT OF STUDENT GRIEVANCE POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Teachers College respects the right of its students to file grievances, and recognizes that students have the right to expect their grievances to be heard fairly and addressed in a timely manner. Teachers College also recognizes that grievance procedures should be clearly articulated to both students and staff. In return, Teachers College reminds students that they have responsibilities as both students and professionals.

Most grievances are grounded in confusing procedures or in unpublished sets of expectations for faculty and for students. It is imperative that all College policies and procedures, as well as expectations of faculty and students, be clarified and made as explicit as possible. The College should also provide for periodic and systematic review of policies and procedures to assure they are functioning well and remain aligned with the institution’s mission and academic programs.

Graduate and Professional Student Rights

- A graduate student has the right to be respected as a person of merit and junior colleague upon gaining admission to a graduate program.

- Graduate students have the right to be incorporated into the decision-making process within their department or academic program, including but not limited to decisions on curriculum, funding, and school governance.

- Graduate students have the right to an accurate description of the availability and likelihood of financial and resource support within their program.
  - Prospective and currently-enrolled graduate students will be provided with a thorough description of the requirements and qualifications necessary for academic employment, training or financial support at the College. This information will be provided by the academic program upon a student’s acceptance to Teachers College and on a regular basis thereafter.
  - Departments and programs will consider the need to provide adequate graduate student space, as appropriate.
  - Graduate students have the right to specific and concrete requirements for achieving advanced degrees. These requirements will be communicated clearly to students upon entrance to graduate programs.

- Prospective and currently-enrolled graduate students have a right to know the expected time to degree completion and the average time to degree completion within their specific graduate program. This information will be furnished to prospective students.

- Prospective and currently-enrolled students have the right to know a program’s student attrition rate and, if available, the predominant reasons for lack of degree
completion. This information will be furnished to prospective students by the department and the Admission Office.

- Doctoral students will be provided with a clear and concise outline of the various requirements for the doctoral degree, and an expected timeline for completion of these requirements, by their academic program.

- Graduate students have the right to have their progress towards achieving an advanced degree be evaluated in an objective manner and based on criteria that are understood by the graduate advisor and the students.

- Evaluations will be factual, specific, and shared with students within a reasonable period of time. Evaluations that should be in writing include: annual progress reports or research appraisals, decisions on qualifying examinations, and unusual or additional program requirements. Students should be made aware of the criteria upon which they will be evaluated prior to the evaluation itself.

- The reasons for unsatisfactory performance on programmatic examinations should be stated clearly to students in a written evaluation.

- Graduate students have the right to regular feedback and guidance on his or her academic performance.

- Each graduate student has the right to enlist an official faculty advisor who will help the student in achieving his or her program objective. The student and faculty advisor should arrive at and maintain a mutually agreeable schedule of evaluative and/or supervisory conferences.

- Graduate students have the right to a fair opportunity to correct or remedy deficiencies in their academic performance.

- Dismissal of a student from a graduate program for academic reasons will occur only when the student (1) has been issued specific, written performance information; (2) has received advance written notification that he or she may be dismissed for specifically identified academic reasons; and (3) has been given a fair and adequate opportunity to amend his or her academic record.

- Graduate students have the right to be free from unjust discrimination in all matters relating to the university, including but not limited to discrimination on the basis of: race, gender, age, sexual orientation, disability, religion or political beliefs.

- Graduate students have the right to reasonable confidentiality in their communications with professors.

- A professor should not discuss a student’s performance with other students.

- Discussions among faculty regarding a student’s performance in a graduate program will be of a professional nature, and limited to a student’s academic performance and fitness as a graduate student.
• Graduate students have the right to refuse to perform tasks if those tasks are not closely related to their academic or professional development program. Graduate students will not be exploited to the personal advantage of any faculty member.

• Graduate students have a right to co-authorship in publications involving the students’ significant contributions of ideas or research work. A student will receive “first authorship” for publications that are primarily the result of creative research and writing performed by the student. Faculty and graduate students should agree upon the order of authorship as early as possible, commensurate with their respective levels of contribution to the work.

• Graduate students reserve those rights not specifically enumerated in this document, but otherwise specified by the university, the academic community, or the nation.

Graduate and Professional Student Responsibilities

• Graduate students have a responsibility to conduct themselves, in all educational activities, in a manner befitting academicians or professionals in their field of study.

• Graduate students have a responsibility to devote an appropriate amount of time and effort toward achieving their degrees, except when special circumstances apply.

• Graduate students have a responsibility to uphold accepted academic standards, including but not limited to: (1) accurate and honest reporting of research results; (2) ethical research methodology and scholarship, and (3) responsible teaching practices.

• Graduate students have a responsibility to participate in the campus community:
  - To make an effort to contribute to the academic reputation and social environment of their academic program.
  - To make an effort to enrich the College and the University.
  - To ask questions that promote their understanding of the academic and financial requirements of their specific graduate program.
  - To understand the proper and expected relationship between faculty mentor and graduate student, and to actively participate in the development of an amicable and effective partnership.
  - To have an awareness of time constraints and other demands imposed on faculty and staff.
  - To communicate clearly and regularly with faculty mentors and advisors, especially in matters related to degree progress.
  - To show respect through word and action to the university and all its employees, to respect the rights and responsibilities of other students, and to show respect to the communities that surround our campuses.
Graduate students are subject to other responsibilities not specifically enumerated herein. Omission of a responsibility from this document does not relieve them of any obligation.

Graduate students have an obligation to be aware of the responsibilities that they bear as graduate students, and to adhere to the standards of conduct that apply to them.

Potential Categories of Grievances

Grievances filed by students may include but are not limited to:

- lack of adequate advising;
- plagiarism by faculty/another student;
- no credit given for student research;
- grade disputes;
- unfair or biased treatment and evaluation (e.g., getting a lower grade because a student disagrees with his/her professor); and
- lack of communication between Columbia University and Teachers College.

Student Grievance Procedures. Students who have grievances that relate to academic or nonacademic matters and who seek a review of their grievances should follow these procedures within six months from the time the action occurred and/or the grade was posted.

It is recommended that student grievances begin with the person against whom the grievance is being made. If the issue involves the instructor of a course, the grievance is with the instructor. The student shall first contact him or her and attempt to resolve the grievance. Pertinent documentation should accompany the grievance. If the grievance is not resolved at the level of the instructor, the student should schedule an appointment with the program coordinator, the second level for review of grievances.

If the grievance is not resolved at the level of the program coordinator, the third level of appeal is the academic department chairperson. The department chairperson, at his or her discretion, may call a meeting of the instructor, the program coordinator, and the student. If resolution of the grievance is achieved at either the second or third stage, the program director or chairperson, respectively, will send a memo to all those involved confirming the outcome.

In instances where a student believes that the program or department is not a safe place to air grievances, he/she may directly approach either the Associate Dean for Enrollment and Student Services (nonacademic matters) or the Associate Dean for Academic Administration (academic matters) to request a meeting with members of the Student Conduct Committee. Constituting a grievance panel comprised of three faculty members and two students from the Student Conduct Committee will provide an alternate space for students to discuss grievances and arrive at resolutions.
If there is no satisfactory resolution of the student grievance at the departmental level in the judgment of the student, or if the nature of the grievance involves a personal or confidential matter, the student may bring the grievance to the attention of the Associate Dean. The Associate Dean, in consultation with the Student Conduct Committee, is responsible for administering the student grievance and may, when appropriate, make recommendations for the resolution of student grievances. Recommendations for the resolution of student grievances may be appealed to the Dean, and, as a final level of appeal, the President of the College.
The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) affords students certain rights with respect to their education records. These rights include:

1. The right to inspect and review the student’s education records within 45 days of the day the College receives a request for access. Students should submit to the Office of the Registrar an official, written request that identifies the record(s) they wish to inspect. The Registrar, or the Registrar’s designee will make arrangements for access and notify the student of the time and place where the records may be inspected. If the records are not maintained by the Office of the Registrar, the Registrar or the Registrar’s designee will advise the student of the appropriate official to whom the request should be addressed.

2. The right to request an amendment of the student’s education record that the student believes is inaccurate. Students may ask the College to amend a record that they believe is inaccurate. They should write to the College official responsible for the record, clearly identify the part of the record they want changed, and specify why it is inaccurate. If the College decides not to amend the record as requested by the student, the College will notify the student of the decision and advise the student of his or her right to a hearing on the request for amendment. Additional information on the hearing procedures will be provided to the student when notified of the right to a hearing.

3. The right to consent to disclosures of personally identifiable information contained in the student’s education records, except to the extent that FERPA authorizes disclosure without consent. One exception which permits disclosure without consent is disclosure to school officials with legitimate educational interests. A school official is a person employed by the College in an administrative, supervisory, academic or research or support staff position (including student workers); a person or company with whom the university has contracted (such as an attorney, auditor or collection agent); a person serving on the Board of Trustees; or a student serving on an official committee, such as a disciplinary or grievance committee, or assisting another school official in performing his or her tasks. A school official has a legitimate educational interest if the official needs to review an education record to fulfill his or her professional responsibility.

4. The right to file a complaint with the U.S. Department of Education concerning alleged failures by the College to comply with the requirements of FERPA. The name and address of the Office that administers FERPA is:

   Family Policy Compliance Office
   U.S. Department of Education
   400 Maryland Avenue, SW
   Washington, DC 20202-4605

5. The College or University may release “directory information” with respect to a student. The University and College are required to give notice of the categories of information
which are defined as “directory information.” Accordingly, the College hereby gives notice that it has designated the following categories of information as directory information with respect to each student: name, mailing and permanent addresses, photo, email address, major field of study, dates of attendance at the College, degrees conferred and their dates.

A student in attendance at the College who does not wish the “directory information” released should notify the Office of the Registrar in writing of his/her wish to withhold such information.

6. Upon written request by a student, the College will release information in a student’s education records at Teachers College to third parties. The student should make a request in writing with the student’s signature for such release to the Office of the Registrar. A student will ordinarily not be provided with copies of any part of his or her record other than the Teachers College transcript, unless the inability to obtain copies of any part of the record, other than the transcript, would effectively prevent the student from exercising the right to inspect and review their educational records. The College may impose a charge for copying a student’s records in connection with such a release. In general, the charge will not exceed 20 cents per page, except for the charge of $5.00 for a transcript.

It shall be a condition of the release by the College of any personal information on a student to a third party that the party to which the information is released will not permit employees and agents to use such information, but only for the purpose for which the disclosure was made.

7. Students may obtain copies of these “Guidelines and Statement of Policy” of the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) at the Office of the Associate Dean for Academic Administration, 113 Main Hall.

Questions about the interpretation of the Guidelines should be referred to the Registrar, 150 Horace Mann.
## Appendix VI. C: 2004 and 2005 New Students Survey—Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check-in Process—Friday</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome and Opening Comments</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.732</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar and Computer Information Services Presentation</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Insurance and Immunization Requirements Presentation</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security Presentation</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid and Student Accounts Presentation</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greet, Meet, and Eat Lunch Discussions</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Services Session</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Your Money Session</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Students Session</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library and Computing and Information Services Session</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance and Immunization Records Session</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting to Teachers College Session</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Tours</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop 'Til You Drop Saturday Event</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tips and Chips! Saturday Event</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night on the Town, Teachers College Style! Saturday Event</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazing Race! Sunday Event</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids Walking Tour! Sunday Event</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Sundae” Night Social! Sunday Event</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Indies Day Parade in Brooklyn! Monday Event</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Tours of Harlem and Morningside Heights Monday Event</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday Night at the Movies!</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check-in—Tuesday</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome and Faculty Panel Discussion on Educational Equity</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC Informational Fair</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Orientation</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Organizations and Student Senate Wine and Cheese Reception</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC Bookbags</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Party</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Orientation</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Advising</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VII: EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

STANDARD 10
Faculty

Introduction

This chapter of our self-study report focuses on the Faculty and Instructional Staff of Teachers College, and provides additional information to document that the College’s instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, and supported by qualified professionals. An extended discussion of faculty authority and governance roles was provided in Chapter III, and other aspects of the roles and responsibilities of faculty are referenced in discussions of other standards, in particular: Standard 2—Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal (Chapter II); Standard 6—Integrity (Chapter IV); and Standard 11—Educational Offerings (Chapter VIII).

Additionally, the Subcommittee preparing the report on faculty was charged to address the following:

- What are the procedures for hiring, granting tenure, and promoting full-time regular faculty?
- How are adjunct faculty, lecturers, and instructors hired and evaluated?
- How do faculty remain engaged in the development, maintenance, and assessment of Teachers College’s academic programs?
- How does the College encourage and recognize multiple modes of teaching, research, and service, and provide ongoing opportunities for professional development?
- What is the faculty’s role and responsibility in student academic advisement?

Overview of the Faculty

As a general charge, the Faculty Handbook provides an overview of faculty responsibility and authority:

The Faculty of Teachers College play a central role in determining the standards, the values, and the character of the institution. Members of the Faculty provide the instruction, conduct the research, and perform the professional services necessary to accomplish the purposes of the College. The Faculty, subject only to the control reserved by the Trustees, have ultimate authority to establish requirements for student admission, programs of instruction, and student academic progress, and to recommend the conferring of degrees and diplomas. The Faculty also make recommendations to the President and the Trustees concerning its own welfare.¹

¹Copies of the Faculty Handbook will be available to the evaluation team during the site visit.
As a comprehensive graduate and professional school of education enrolling 5,070 students (Fall, 2005) in a diverse range of programs offered through nine departments, Teachers College requires a core of full-time faculty, complemented by sufficient term, visiting, adjunct, and other part-time appointments, to offer the highly specialized and differentiated courses necessary to meet the education and training needs of the programs and students. The character and composition of the faculty is a critical factor in realizing the diverse and multicultural graduate and professional community to which the College is committed. Teachers College is actively committed to providing expanding opportunities to minorities, both in its own activities as well as in the broader society. The following sections provide a snapshot of the current size and composition of the Faculty of Teachers College.

For the 2005-06 academic year, Teachers College has 154 full-time faculty on appointment. The College currently has 13 searches for new faculty appointments underway, as follows: English Education (2), Social Studies, TESOL, Early Childhood Education, Inclusive Education, Preservice Elementary/Childhood Education, Teaching of ASL as a Foreign Language, Blindness/Visual Impairment, Developmental Psychology, International Education Programs (Peace Studies in Education), Education Leadership (Leadership, Policy, and Politics), and Social-Organizational Psychology. If all open positions are filled, this would bring the total number of faculty at the College to 167, barring retirements or other departures. Of the 154 faculty who are currently on appointment, the distribution by rank is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below reports women and minorities as a proportion of the Teachers College Faculty for the 2005-06 academic year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenured</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the faculty on regular appointment, the instructional staff of the College includes a range of other academic appointments that are essential to a diverse, complex mix of

---

2The designation “faculty on appointment” is used at the College to refer to only those individuals appointed to the faculty at the rank of Assistant, Associate or Full Professor. This includes appointments to research professor and professor of practice titles, but does not include individuals whose primary appointment is administrative (e.g., the Associate Dean) and who hold a faculty appointment that is co-terminus with their administrative appointment.
programs of research and instruction set in a graduate professional school of education. These alternative appointments include Lecturer, Adjunct Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, and Instructor. These appointments can be grouped into two general categories. The first consists of all non-faculty academic appointees holding the doctorate. For the 2005-06 academic year, approximately 130 appointments fall into this category. The number of part-time adjuncts includes individuals appointed as “visiting professors” who are on faculty appointments at other institutions. Honorary appointments are not included. The second general category includes non-faculty academic appointees who do not hold the doctorate. For the 2005-06 academic year, approximately 150 appointments are in this category.

Trends in the Size and Composition of the Faculty

The following section highlights trends in the size and composition of the faculty, placing those trends within the context of personnel policies and practices that govern the recruitment and initial appointment of faculty. Later sections discuss personnel policies and practices related to reappointment, appointment to tenure, and promotion in rank.

Briefly, in 1985-86, with total student enrollments at the College of 4,017, 130 faculty were on appointment. By 1990, as a consequence of early retirement incentives and other departures, while the authorized size of the faculty was approximately 130 and student enrollments had increased to 4,279, the number of faculty on appointment declined to 119. By 1996-97, at the time of the last self-study report and site visit, the number of faculty on appointment had increased to 125 (student enrollment: 4,716), and by academic year 2000-01 at the time of our Periodic Progress Report, faculty on appointment numbered 131 (student enrollment: 4,945). As noted, with current enrollments of approximately 5,070 students, 154 faculty are presently on appointment (167 authorized positions, 13 in search).

The net overall change in the size of the faculty is only part of an important phenomenon. From 1985-86 forward, an even more substantial reshaping of the faculty occurred through the combined impact of annual retirements, resignations, and other departures on the one hand, and new faculty recruitments, appointments, and promotion to tenure on the other. Of the faculty currently on appointment (AY2005-06), approximately 75% were appointed subsequent to the 1985-86 academic year, and of that group, approximately 56% will have been appointed subsequent to 1996-97.

The College maintains a permission-to-recruit process in which each request for new faculty recruitment proceeds through a layered review to assure a balance between the need to maintain the quality and vitality of existing programs, while also responding to new program development opportunities and enrollment growth. Each request to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean for permission to recruit is evaluated according to a set of criteria developed in collaboration with the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) and department chairs: cost, demand, centrality, quality, diversity (ethnic as well as professional “thought”), and space. Reviews of requests for permission to recruit are also informed by department plans which describe the department’s programs, the size and composition of its faculty, and the number and types of students enrolled. A recently revised permission to recruit form standardizes both the information requested and the

\[3\] A brief description of the categories of faculty and instructional appointments is provided in “Information about Docket” which will be available in the Resource Room during the site visit.
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presentation of that information to department chairs and FEC for review. It is also important to note that faculty vacancies remain in departments rather than returning to the “College” for reallocation. Therefore, vacancies in faculty positions that were part of approved plans—assuming no other change in the core components of the plan—remain as department vacancies and are reviewed through the permission to recruit process discussed above.

In all instances in the selection of new faculty members, national searches are undertaken. New appointments are typically authorized at the assistant or associate level, but attention is also given to programmatic factors, which may make the addition of experienced senior staff desirable and necessary (e.g., the relationship between tenured and non-tenured professors, compelling program development or maintenance requirements). In such instances, new appointments come to the College with tenure as associate or full professor rank.

Table 7.2. Faculty by Rank as Percent of Total Teachers College Faculty (1985-2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assistant</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>% Total</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>% Total</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above illustrates trends in the distribution of faculty appointments by rank. As the result of the combination of faculty retirements at generally more senior levels, and new faculty appointments at generally more junior levels, the distribution of faculty appointments by rank has changed substantially from 1985-86 through 2000-01, toward a relatively more junior faculty. Similarly, over the same period, the number and proportion of faculty who were tenured declined from 101 (78%) in academic year 1985-86 to 88 (70%) in academic year 1996-97, and remained at 88 (67%) on a larger total faculty base during the current academic year (2005-06). Over the past five years, reflecting strong recruiting initiatives and successful reappointment and

---

4 A copy of the “Guidelines for Permission to Recruit” form will be available with materials in the Resource Room.
promotion reviews, the proportion and number of faculty appointed to tenure has increased to 69% (n=106), and the proportion of faculty at the rank of Full Professor has increased slightly from 43% in 2000-01 to 45% in the current academic year.

Enhancing Faculty Diversity

The change in the size of the overall faculty was also accompanied by other changes in the composition of the faculty. One important feature of this change involves the diversity of the faculty with respect to the proportion of women and minorities. The character and composition of the faculty are critical factors in realizing a diverse and multicultural graduate and professional community. Teachers College as an institution has long been committed to a policy of equal opportunity in employment. For each search advertised, the following statement is included:

*Teachers College as an institution is committed to a policy of equal opportunity in employment. In offering education, psychology, and health studies, the College is committed to providing expanding employment opportunities to persons of color, women, and persons with disabilities in its own activities and in society. Candidates whose qualifications and experience are directly relevant to College priorities (e.g., urban issues, education equity, and concerns of underrepresented groups) may be considered for higher rank than advertised.*

The President and the Dean are deeply committed to increasing the diversity of the faculty. The Affirmative Action Committee is co-chaired by the Dean and two elected committee members and charged by the President to set policy and to actively participate in faculty recruitment. The faculty voted to have as a goal that one-third of all new faculty hires would be from targeted groups. This goal continues to shape vigorous efforts to assure minority representation in each search. Additionally, the Affirmative Action Committee created a “Five Year Plan for Affirmative Action at Teachers College: Report of the Affirmative Action Committee” in February of 1992. This plan was both a report of the Affirmative Action Committee for a five-year plan for recruitment and retention of faculty from racial or ethnic minority groups and a report of the Committee on recruitment and retention of faculty and staff persons with disabilities (see attached report).

The Affirmative Action Committee compiled an Affirmative Action Handbook in June, 1994, which is distributed to all search chairs before a search begins. It contains a statement of Affirmative Action Policy in general, as well as the procedures required before a faculty position can be offered. Throughout the search process, records must be kept concerning all candidacies as well as affirmative action reports. At the start of the search process, an Affirmative Action Plan for each search is submitted. Search chairs and/or affirmative action representatives on search committees are required to attend one meeting with the Affirmative Action Committee to report on their affirmative action efforts and the status of their searches. Halfway through the process, an Affirmative Action Interim Report updates the Dean and the Affirmative Action Committee.

---

5A copy of this Affirmative Action Plan is provided with the Affirmative Action Handbook and related materials which will be available to the site visit team in the Resource Room. The Affirmative Action Committee is currently composed of faculty at each rank, student and professional staff representatives, and is chaired by Dean Bailey.
Committee on the status of the search, the most useful recruitment procedures, and an indication of the number of applications from candidates of color. At the end of the process, the Committee should include in its Form A of the Affirmative Action Recruitment Summary the total number of candidates in the pool and the total number of interviewed candidates, detailing to the extent possible representation by gender and race/ethnicity group. This report must be submitted and reviewed by the Dean before an offer can be made. The Form B of the Affirmative Action Recruitment Summary must be completed for each individual interviewed, reporting the date and place of interview, gender, citizenship, race/ethnicity group, veteran status, and the overall evaluation that was made.

Additionally, a database survey titled Optional Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Data Request Form was created to collect information on applicants’ gender, race/ethnicity, and how each heard about the position. Once a complete application is received, an email is sent to the applicant to self-identify his/her gender and race/ethnicity and to indicate how he/she heard of the position. This system allows Teachers College to have accurate affirmative action information to see what efforts are working to attract minority applicants and which are not.

Recognizing that both the quality and diversity of the Teachers College Faculty must be not just preserved but enhanced, in addition to regular faculty recruitments authorized through the permission-to-recruit process, the College implemented a “Target of Opportunity” faculty recruitment program. The intent of the program has been to increase the diversity and strength of the faculty by providing for the possible recruitment of unusually able and prominent scholars at the forefront of one of the fields or disciplines of the College. From 1997, three faculty members have been hired under this program.

Table 7.3. Women as Percent of the Tenured and Non-Tenured Faculty at Teachers College: 1985 to 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tenured Faculty</th>
<th>Non-Tenured Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due at least in part to the College’s focus and commitment to diversity, the change in the size of the overall faculty was accompanied by changes in the composition of the faculty with
respect to the proportion of women and minorities. In 1985-86, 7 of the 130 faculty on appointment (5\%) were minorities and 42 (32\%) were female. In 1996-97, 15 of the 125 faculty on appointment (12\%) were minorities and 66 (53\%) were female. In the current academic year, 32 of the 154 faculty on appointment (21\%) are minorities and 92 (60\%) are female.

Table 7.4. Minorities as Percent of the Tenured and Non-Tenured Faculty at Teachers College: 1985 to 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tenured Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Tenured Faculty</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, as the tables above illustrate, the representation of women and minorities also improved among tenured faculty. The number and proportion of faculty who were women and tenured increased from 21\% (n=27) of the total faculty (n=130) and from 27\% of all tenured faculty (n=101) in 1985-86, to 36\% (n=56) of all faculty (n=154) and 53\% of all tenured faculty (n=106) in the current academic year.

Similarly, the proportion of minority faculty who were tenured increased from 2\% (n=3) of the total faculty (n=130) and 3\% of the tenured faculty (n=101) in 1985-86, to 11\% (n=17) of the total faculty (n=154) and 16\% (n=106) of the tenured faculty in the current academic year.

**Student:Faculty Ratios**

In addition to the 167 full-time faculty positions approved in the 2005-06 academic year budget, as noted earlier, the instructional staff of the College also includes a range of other academic appointments that are essential to a diverse, complex mix of programs of research and instruction set in a graduate professional school of education. Both full-time faculty on appointment and their instructional staff colleagues appointed as adjuncts, lecturers or instructors work formally and informally with students as advisors and mentors.

Nonetheless, one concern that has been underscored by our current self-study review involves student:faculty ratios at the College, as one specific measure, and academic advising as
a broader but related concern. Academic advising was discussed at greater length in Chapter VI, which focused on Standard 8 (Student Admission) and Standard 9 (Student Support Services).

While the College has made considerable progress toward the goal of lowering the student:faculty ratio at the College, high ratios are perceived as a contributing factor to academic advising concerns. Given both the student enrollment profiles (e.g., full-time vs. part-time) and the range of appointment characteristics of instructional staff, the College reports student:faculty ratios in three different ways. The first is the ratio of the number of full-time faculty to total student enrollments; the second is the ratio of all full-time instructional staff to total students enrolled; and the third is the ratio of all instructional staff (full-time and part-time, with part-time staff expressed as FTE, i.e., Full Time Equivalent) to the FTE student enrollments. The student:faculty ratios for academic year 2005 are:

Student:Faculty 30.2:1
Student:FT Instructional Personnel 26.3:1
Student:FTE Instructional Personnel 13.8:1

Since 2004, the goal has been to move towards a ratio of 25:1 (currently at 26.3:1) for the Student:FT Instructional Personnel ratio and steady progress has been made towards accomplishing that goal. Over the past several years, with relatively stable or modest increases in student enrollments, the number of faculty on appointment has increased at a much faster pace than enrollments.

The Comprehensive Modeling exercise in which the College is currently engaged as part of strategic planning, while primarily concerned with identifying an enrollment mix that creates a sustainable financial bottom line for the College, has also considered and incorporated a number of academic goals. Among these goals are that at least 50% of points be taught by full-time faculty on appointment and 60% by full-time faculty and full-time instructional staff. Another goal is a reduction in student:faculty ratios, in particular the advising ratio for doctoral students, which is currently above norms.

Faculty Personnel Policies, Practices, and Procedures

The College has established and maintains a variety of personnel policies, practices, and procedures which are instrumental to its success in continuing to recruit and retain a first-class faculty. Since the previous self-study, and also more recently within the context of the reorganization of the academic program, the faculty have adopted or taken under consideration several changes to these policies and practices. The following sections provide a brief review and discussion of those changes within three related categories: reappointment, tenure, and promotion; salary; and alternative forms of appointment to the instructional staff of the College.

Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion

---

6Tables providing these data on a program-by-program within-department basis will be available in the Resource Room during the site visit.
The basic framework and substantive content of the current personnel policies and procedures were developed through a joint faculty and administrative effort over the course of the 1985-86 and 1986-87 academic years, with the new policies and procedures adopted by the faculty and the College in 1987. The current personnel policies documents—“Principles Governing the Reappointment of Full-time Members of the Faculty, Promotion in Academic Rank, and the Award of Tenure at Teachers College, Columbia University” and “College-Wide Means”7—were last updated in AY2004-05. The following is a brief overview of the personnel policies governing reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

The breadth and diversity of programs with multiple approaches to original scholarship and the preparation of first-class professionals and leaders in several fields require a broad range of competencies among the faculty. This means, among other things, that some faculty will show their greatest strengths in teaching and advisement, others in research. All faculty members must be highly accomplished in all aspects of performance, even though the configuration of an excellent record may vary over time, according to each individual's experience, responsibilities, and interests.

Guiding Assumption. The strength of any institution of higher learning is determined primarily by the quality of its faculty. The vitality of the institution’s academic programs, its attractiveness to able students, its ability to exert leadership through its public and published works and through the placement of its graduates in positions of influence—all depend upon the quality of the individuals who constitute its faculty. The careful evaluation of faculty performance is a vital component in a systematic effort to assure a faculty of the highest quality. What is sought in this evaluation is a demonstrated pattern of excellence and originality, together with the promise of continued growth and development.

Multiple Points of Evaluation. Pre-tenured faculty evaluation prior to appointment to tenure takes several forms. In addition to two formal reappointment reviews (the first of which occurs in the third year of full-time service, and, if successful, leads to reappointment; the second of which occurs in the sixth year of full-time service, and, if successful, leads to appointment to tenure), pre-tenured faculty also have an annual developmental conference with their department chair. The primary objective of these conferences is the improvement of individual performance toward meeting the criteria of excellence in scholarly productivity in research, teaching and advisement, and service to the College and the profession that is required for appointment to tenure.

In addition to the annual developmental conference, the reappointment review during the third year of full-time service is modeled on the review for appointment to tenure, described below. Candidates prepare an extensive dossier which provides evidence of accomplishment in each of the three review categories. As with the review for tenure, the reappointment review process requires recommendations from internal faculty colleagues, teaching observations, and the department chair’s independent assessment. Furthermore, the department obtains judgments from peers in other institutions in order to broaden the basis for the decision to reappoint. External reviewers are asked to provide their assessment of the candidate’s professional reputation and standing as a scholar relative to outstanding people in the same field at approximately the same

---

7These policy documents are available in the Faculty Handbook which accompanied our self-study report.
stage of career development. Similarly, systematic solicitation of the experience of students in the domains of teaching and advising is also required, and documentation of evaluations from students—in a variety of forms, including course evaluations as well as confidential letters/surveys from students and advisees—is included in the set of materials assembled for review. The reappointment procedure for non-tenure track faculty are a bit modified; external review letters are not required and less emphasis is placed on research productivity.

Once the dossier is complete and reviewed by the department, a meeting is convened by the Dean with the department chair, the candidate, and the Associate Dean in order to discuss the dossier and share information that would be relevant to the reappointment decision. A successful review not only leads to reappointment, but also provides pre-tenured faculty with specific critique, formative and summative evaluation, and a plan for professional development in preparation for the review for appointment to tenure.

Criteria for Evaluation. In assessing the faculty member’s performance for tenure, three broad areas are evaluated:

• **Scholarly Productivity in Research:** As a graduate professional school affiliated with a major research university, with program emphases in the broad areas of education, psychology, and the health-related services and sciences, Teachers College is committed to the discovery, conceptualization, development, testing, and application of the knowledge and theory upon which improved practice in these areas should be based. This commitment has characterized the College throughout its history and is the primary basis for its pre-eminence in many fields. Therefore, faculty members are expected to engage continually in scholarly activities designed to advance theory and practice.

Given the range of programs at the College and the diversity of scholarly styles that necessarily mark a graduate professional school, the assumption is that productive scholarly activities will take many forms and involve many disciplines, and will be presented publicly to professional peers who will judge them to be creative, important, disciplined, and valuable. Among the forms of productive scholarship are: the formulation and/or testing of hypotheses by empirical methods; the extension of existing knowledge or theory to new contexts or conditions; the synthesis or analysis of existing knowledge or theory to develop new or broader and more general theory; the discovery of new facts or principles through scientific, historical or philosophical inquiry; the systematic translation of research findings into new instructional materials, methods or technologies; the development, evaluation, and testing of innovative designs of various sorts; and the application of existing knowledge, procedures or theory to the solution of current issues and problems.

In addition to independent work, faculty members are encouraged to collaborate with other colleagues or with students whom the faculty member is supervising in the conduct of their research. In joint work, the distinct scholarly contribution of the individual being evaluated must be evident.

• **Scholarly Teaching and Advisement:** As a graduate professional center of study for the education, psychological, and health professions, Teachers College attracts and
instructs students who expect effective teaching. Effective teaching at the graduate professional level links productive scholarship to larger bodies of historical and contemporary knowledge, relates these to practical concerns, and instills in students the scholarly attitudes appropriate to their professions. Teaching involves the reciprocal relationship between the teacher and the larger professional audience and/or the public at large, whereby the teacher is also an active learner. This function is derived from the College’s historic role as a leader in U.S. and international education.

Advisement of students and the supervision of doctoral study evidences the time, care, and concern the teacher gives to the intellectual and professional development of students. All of these aspects of teaching and advisement require high-level scholarly and technical expertise, and the ability to communicate scholarly materials and procedures in interesting, persuasive, and effective ways.

- **Scholarly Service to the College and the Profession:** The College requires the active participation and special expertise of its faculty in peer review, collegial governance, quality control of programs, and program development. Faculty participate in a wide range of activities that provide service to and visibility in the professions of education, psychology, and the health services. Thus, faculty may serve as officers of professional associations, members of review panels, editors of professional journals, and speakers before professional and lay groups.

Beyond the College and the profession, faculty are frequently called upon to serve locally, nationally or internationally, to counsel, advise, and consult to outside organizations or agencies in the development of education policy, plans, programs experiments, and innovations. Such relationships are essential to the vitality of the society and the College, especially as they test, refine, and extend professional knowledge that results in the improvement of the human condition.

**Patterns and Quality of Performance.** Policy and practice at the College provide that the decision to reappoint or not to reappoint, to promote or not to promote, to grant tenure or not to grant tenure is based primarily upon qualitative rather than quantitative assessment of the individual’s performance in the three areas described above. Moreover, while the three areas of performance may be isolated for purposes of analysis and data-gathering, they are inseparable in the development of a faculty member’s career. Hence, decisions with respect to reappointment, promotion, and tenure are based on an overall qualitative assessment of scholarly performance which takes into account these close interrelationships. What is sought is a demonstrated pattern of excellence and originality together with the promise of continued growth and development. In practice over the past two decades, establishing the presence or absence of these patterns of performance and potentiality has proved the most crucial, difficult, and sometimes vexing dimension of the review process.

While all three areas of performance require consideration in making every reappointment, promotion, and tenure decision, not all faculty members will engage in all activities to the same degree. Differences in emphasis given to the three areas can arise from the individual’s own abilities, background, and interests, as well as the demands imposed by departmental and College requirements. Configurations of effort may change; a given area may occupy a greater or lesser
part of an individual’s responsibilities at any given time. Additionally, the developmental level of the faculty member undergoing evaluation must also be given consideration in applying standards of performance. While the areas in which a faculty member is expected to demonstrate competence remain constant, the standards that reflect necessary and sufficient levels of performance vary with the stage of the individual’s career. The continued strength of the College dictates that, over extended periods of time, activity must be carried on in all three areas (scholarly productivity in research, teaching, and service) and must be judged excellent in each area. The overall configuration of performance across all three areas must be excellent.

Evaluation Process and Procedures. By Statute, the tenure decision must be made by the end of the sixth year of service at the College and the review for tenure is ordinarily initiated at the beginning of the sixth year of service. The review process ordinarily should be completed, and the candidate informed of the decision, prior to May of that year of service. In the case that a faculty member started mid-year (January rather than September), the review process should be completed, and the candidate informed of the decision, prior to December of the sixth year of service. There are two exceptions to tenure review in the sixth year: (a) those cases in which an early review is requested by the candidate or the department; and, (b) those cases in which an individual is being considered for an award of tenure at the time of initial appointment to the faculty. In all of these cases, a process which clearly articulates and defines the responsibilities of all parties is followed.8

The policies and procedures for promotion to full professor are substantially similar to the tenure review process. Perhaps the main substantive difference is that for appointment to tenure, a candidate should demonstrate excellent performance in all three areas of activity and should show evidence of continued promise as a scholar and teacher, whereas for promotion to full professor, which is the highest recognition the College can award to faculty who have demonstrated excellence in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service, with evidence of continued significant contributions in each, the candidate for promotion should have achieved a degree of professional stature and be recognized as making a significant contribution to scholarship in the College and the profession at large.

Periodically, in consultation with the faculty, these policies have been revised for clarity and consistency, or to adjust procedures to reflect institutional changes. One important change involves the creation of the Standing Committee on Appointment to Tenure and the Standing Committee on Promotion to Full Professor.9 Prior to the establishment of standing committees for both tenure and promotion decisions, the personnel policies had provided for sequential reviews and recommendations from the department to the division to a College-wide ad hoc

---

8For the award of tenure, for example, the responsibilities of each party are the layered review process are detailed on pages 13-18 of “Principles Governing the Reappointment of Full-time Members of the Faculty, Promotion in Academic Rank, and the Award of Tenure at Teachers College,” which is provided in Section 5 of the Faculty Handbook.

9The Committee on Appointment to Tenure is composed of seven members: four elected from the ranks tenured Associate or Full Professors, two appointed by the Dean for one-year terms, and one appointed on an ad hoc basis from a list of four faculty nominated by the candidate. The Committee on Promotion to Full Professor is composed of three members elected from the ranks tenured Full Professors, one member appointed by the Dean for a one-year term, and one is appointed on an ad hoc basis from a list of four faculty nominated by the candidate. The department chair may be requested to join the meeting to answer questions, but does not vote.
committee, individually constituted for each review, which would review the candidate’s materials and the recommendations made at previous levels. The creation of standing committees for both appointment to tenure and promotion to full professor was a response to several institutional dynamics, particularly a concern for the fair and consistent application of criteria across the different departments and disciplines.

There is general consensus that the Standing Committee on Appointment to Tenure has largely addressed the concerns for the fair and consistent application of criteria across the different departments and disciplines that surfaced under the former ad hoc system. From 1994-95 through the current academic year, 62 of the 79 reviews led to positive recommendations for appointment to tenure.

With several years of experience, the Standing Committee on Appointment to Tenure has set for itself the task of reviewing issues and concerns raised during the course of its deliberations, particularly with an eye toward making recommendations for the consideration of the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) with respect to possible revisions to Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures.

Table 7.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reappoint. Negative</th>
<th>Reappoint. Positive</th>
<th>Tenure Negative</th>
<th>Tenure Positive</th>
<th>Promotion Negative</th>
<th>Promotion Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY94-95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY95-96</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY96-97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY97-98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY98-99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY99-00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY00-01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY01-02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY02-03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY03-04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY04-05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flexible Staffing Alternatives. Over the years, the College has developed a number of strategies to provide the capability to respond to new or changing market opportunities, program development needs, and mandates from state, regional or professional accrediting or regulatory bodies. Additionally, in areas where staffing needs are connected to program development initiatives, the Dean’s Office manages a program development fund which, in addition to supporting background work in assessing the potential of a new program and covering any special costs involved in gaining internal and state approval for such programs, also provides initial financing for any additional staff that may be required.

The creative use of adjunct, visiting professors, and term appointments to supplement current faculty has provided departments with the capacity to initiate new program developments without committing College resources to support full-time faculty positions. Over the past
several years, with the approval of the faculty, the College has also used full-time, limited-term, and non-tenure track appointments as a means of providing departments with the resources to address programmatic needs for which traditional tenure-track appointments were less appropriate or feasible. This option was essential in providing the College with the ability to comply with New York State Department of Education re-registration requirements for teacher preparation programs registered with New York State that lead to institutional recommendation for certification to teach in New York State.

One form of limited-term appointment is that of “Research Professor.” With appointments to rank in general equivalent to professor grade—e.g., Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor—this title is granted to individuals who hold the doctorate, who will be assigned to an organized program of research or field service in the institutes, departments or centers of the College, and who are able to support through external grants up to 100% but not less than 60% of full-time academic year salary. These primarily research appointments are created at the invitation and discretion of an academic department, the Dean, and the President. They are co-terminus with external funding, with re-appointment terms of not more than three years, assuming continued funding, with a formal review by the department faculty and the Dean required for each reappointment.

A second form of limited-term appointment is that of “Distinguished Practitioner” or “Professor of Practice” appointment. Appointments to these titles are granted to individuals who are experienced practitioners, who have made substantial contributions to the fields of practice relevant to the programs of study at the College, and who bring unique perspectives as experienced practitioners in the field, complementing the regular faculty in departments and programs. The category of Professor of Practice, with appointments to rank in general equivalent to professor grade—e.g., Assistant Professor of Practice, Associate Professor of Practice, and Professor of Practice—applies only for individuals who hold the doctorate, among other qualifications. The title of Distinguished Practitioner, while based upon similar criteria as those established for Professor of Practice appointments, is given to those who do not hold the doctorate.

Under both alternative forms of limited-duration, non-tenurable term appointments, individuals appointed to both research-oriented and the practice-oriented posts participate fully in the life of the College and the department, with the same faculty rights and responsibilities as untenured faculty.

During the 2004-05 academic year, in collaboration with the FEC Subcommittee on Academic Personnel, the College undertook a review of the criteria and processes for reappointment for all limited-term appointments. The outcome of this review was a Spring, 2005, document draft entitled “Statement of Policy and Procedures regarding Faculty Term Appointments.” Once finalized, the document will be incorporated into the College’s procedures on reappointment by the Dean’s Office. The revised procedures will then be reviewed and approved by the FEC Subcommittee on Academic Personnel, and finally added to the 2006-07 Faculty Handbook, Section 5. The procedures will be in effect Fall of 2006 and beyond.

The College is currently considering some new options with respect to reconceptualizing the tenure and post-tenure review processes. The Dean has voiced her desire to initiate conversations seeking to provide the College with a plan towards alternative paths to recognition
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and reward. At the March, 2005, Faculty Meeting, she referred to her State of the College Address in which she had spoken about the benefits of the College being a focused and purposeful “multiversity” and that there are both challenges and benefits inherent to having nine departments and 65 programs of study. She spoke about challenges to producing strategies for recognition and reward between and among different programs, departments, and College-wide. The Dean has called the College to convene creative conversations with the goal of constructing alternative paths of reward for multiple disciplines and professional responsibilities. In the May, 2005, Faculty Meeting, the Dean stated that she will ask the College to begin to engage in the conversation at a local level. To that end, she has put together a committee of faculty members who will work on the development of a Health Conceptual Framework to mirror the work done by the Teacher Education Policy Committee (TEPC) and the Teachers College Accreditation Team (TCAT) for the College’s NCATE review.

The anticipated outcome of this work will be to unite the College’s faculty and students in the health field under a common, inclusive, and understood mission. From this mission, performance expectations, assessment measures, and admissions criteria will be generated, which will both align with the purpose of the health programs as well as recognize the diversity of faculty and student achievement. Furthermore, the establishment of a conceptual framework will assist the College in program and course alignment. This will encourage more effective course planning and advisement, and will lead into the program and course reviews for the Middle States Report. The next phase will be to continue this work to develop a Psychology Conceptual Framework. With Frameworks in place in place across teacher preparation and school leadership, health, and psychology, the important task of reconceptualizing the tenure and post-tenure review processes will commence.

Faculty Salaries

Policies regarding faculty salaries and compensation are integral to realizing the College’s commitment to recruiting and retaining a first-class faculty. Faculty salary policies are developed by the Dean and the President in consultation with the Faculty Salary Committee. Over the past several years, those discussions have sought, in part, to develop a mutually acceptable basis for setting salary improvement goals. Currently, the base faculty salary goal is to have faculty salaries at each professorial rank at the College at least equal to the average of average faculty salaries at comparable ranks, across a comparison set of peer schools/colleges of education institutions.

Over the past few years, the analysis across comparison institutions revealed that average compensation (salary + fringe benefits) for Teachers College faculty by rank was comparable to or higher than average faculty compensation at the rank of Assistant and Associate Professor for the comparison set of institutions. However, the analyses indicated that average faculty salaries at the rank of Full Professor at the College lagged somewhat behind the average for Full Professors at the comparison institutions. To address those discrepancies, in addition to the annual salary increase that was approved and distributed to all faculty on the salary schedule, supplemental funds were made available as a “catch-up” adjustment to close the gap between average faculty salaries for Full Professors at the College and average salaries for Full Professors across the comparison schools.
In addition to their academic year salaries, current policies provide Teachers College faculty with the opportunity to supplement base academic year salary, either through grants and contracts and/or Summer teaching. During the academic year, faculty may earn up to an additional 20% of base salary, and during the Summer faculty may earn up to an additional 33.3% of academic year base salary. The supplemental compensation policy provides incentives for faculty to participate in sponsored research and training projects and to encourage regular full-time faculty to teach during the Summer session. While individual practice varies widely, on average, in addition to an academic year base salary, Teachers College faculty also receive an additional 20% of base salary from these sources.

**Salary Equity, Salary Compression.** Professor salaries are determined at initial hire when each faculty member is placed on a step on the salary schedule within their rank. Several factors are used to determine that placement, including award date for the doctorate and past experiences, as compared with other faculty at the College. Upon promotion in rank, faculty members are moved to the step of the closest higher salary in the next rank and then moved up two additional steps to recognize their achievement.

At the beginning of every academic year, a salary analysis is completed by the Office of the Dean to determine if any inequities have occurred based on the new-hire salary placements and/or recent promotions, when compared to returning faculty salary placements. In academic year 2005, the Faculty Salary Committee (FSC) undertook a comprehensive review of all faculty salary placements. The review was based on faculty salaries for academic year 2004-05. The purpose of the review was to determine whether or not there were any differences in salaries that were explained by race or gender. Two separate analyses were done, the results of which showed that no differences in salaries could be traced to either race or gender.

In addition to continuing the annual equity salary review by the Office of the Dean, the FSC recommended, and the Office of the Dean concurred, that the salary analysis undertaken by the FSC should be repeated every three years.

**Alternative Approaches to Faculty Compensation.** In addition to refining salary goals over the near term, the discussions between the President and Dean have invited the FSC to explore alternative compensation systems. In inviting the FSC to evaluate the current compensation system and to suggest alternatives, the College has asked the FSC to consider, and augment where appropriate, the following possible institutional goals and objectives for a faculty salary/compensation system:

- Incentivize “meritorious” activities;
- Positively affect faculty morale;
- Address equity concerns;
- Avoid salary compression;
- Provide incentives/rewards for engaging in important and high-impact work tied to College priorities;
- Maintain parity within market to recruit and retain high-quality faculty across all fields;
• Encourage continual professional development; and

• Translate the values of Teachers College as a Research I graduate and professional school into a salary compensation system philosophy.

These discussions are likely to engage the Faculty Salary Committee and the leadership of the College over the next academic year.

Policies/Procedures for Appointment and Reappointment of Adjuncts, Lecturers, and Instructors

As noted earlier, the College has developed a number of strategies to provide the capability to respond to new or changing market opportunities, program development needs, and mandates from state, regional or professional accrediting or regulatory bodies. The creative use of adjunct, visiting professors, and term appointments to supplement current faculty has provided departments with the capacity to initiate new program developments without committing College resources to support full-time faculty positions. Adjunct faculty are part-time faculty with a doctorate and with appointments to rank (Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor or Adjunct Professor) dependent on qualifications and experience; Lecturers are full-time appointments which require an earned doctorate; and appointments to the rank of Instructor can be either part-time or full-time, and are used for instructional staff who do not hold the doctorate.

Policies and procedures for initial appointment and reappointment of adjuncts, lecturers, and instructors have been implemented in a somewhat more decentralized manner than the policies and procedures that obtain to full-time faculty on appointment. Prior budget authorization is required for the appointment of all adjuncts, lecturers, and instructors. When budget authorization and general staffing levels have been approved by the Office of the Dean, the recruitment and appointment of adjuncts, lecturers, and instructors is generally managed at the department level. Some variations across departments in practice and compensation levels have prompted review of current practice, with the Office of the Dean undertaking a more centralized review and approval for all full-time appointments to the instructional staff.

In regards to the formal appointment and reappointment of each member of the instructional staff, proposed appointments of instructional personnel are submitted to the Board of Trustees on a personnel “Docket.” The Docket is a document prepared for the Trustees for their review and approval, approximately four times during an academic year (subject to circumstances). Generally, the items on the Docket are new appointments, reappointments, promotions or title changes for professorial faculty and instructional staff members.

Orientation and Community Building. The Dean’s Office provides instructional personnel with an Instructional Guide for Adjunct Faculty, Lecturers, and Instructors each academic year. This Guide is a resource prepared and updated annually by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the College. It is intended for members of the Teachers College Instructional Staff as a general guide to the organization and operation of the College. It also includes material drawn from the Faculty Handbook, specifically materials related to:

• Degree programs and courses of instruction;
• Mission and goals of the College;
• Key offices at the College; and
• Gottesman Libraries services and functions.

Each year, the Guide is distributed at the Dean’s yearly meeting with adjuncts and instructors, which is a time to share challenges and brainstorm strategies. In addition, the Dean’s Office publishes a “Dean’s News and Notes” for instructional staff that is distributed via e-mail and shared with department chairs. This publication is a way for the College’s adjuncts and instructors to share their accomplishments throughout the year.

Compensation. As with full-time faculty on appointment, the College uses a salary schedule to assign salaries for full-time instructor and lecturer appointments. The instructor/lecturer step schedule is included with the faculty salary schedule.

Compensation for part-time instructional personnel typically follows a per-course rate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$2000/course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$2500/course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Associate Professor</td>
<td>$3000/course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Professor</td>
<td>$3500/course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College has not undertaken a comparative analysis of compensation for full-time instructional staff appointments as it has for full-time faculty on appointment. Given the importance of these alternative appointments, it is important for the College to have a competitive compensation package, particularly with respect to the New York City market.

However, recently, the College reviewed compensation for part-time instructional personnel, and concluded that the current per-course schedule lags behind other institutions. As part of larger initiatives related to course and schedule planning, the College has committed to improving compensation for part-time instructional personnel, but doing so in a way that would be as operating budget-neutral as possible.

Faculty Engagement in the Development, Maintenance, and Assessment of Teachers College’s Academic Programs

Professors inhabit the professional and scholarly roles that enable Teachers College to be a major educational institution. The Faculty at Teachers College represents a wide range of scholarly and professional fields of practice, with a wide variety of methods and practices being used across the College by which faculty meet their obligations to their students, the public, and their professions. As noted earlier, the criteria for reappointment, appointment to tenure, and promotion in rank speak to expectations of scholarly productivity, teaching, and advising, and service to the profession and the College. All faculty members must be highly accomplished in all aspects of performance, even though the configuration of an excellent record may vary over time according to each individual’s experience, responsibilities, and interests.

With regard to faculty members’ involvement in the academic program, faculty are expected to be engaged in scholarly activities in their program that benefit and/or influence the
teaching and advising they provide to their students. These activities should be dual-focused. First, the research and scholarly pursuits of faculty members should be readily apparent and evident in the programs in which they are situated, and second, the academic curriculum should reflect these pursuits.

The Faculty of Teachers College, as with graduate faculty at other national professional and graduate schools, have several primary responsibilities related to the development, maintenance, and assessment of the College’s academic programs:

- Ongoing development or research in the appropriate professional academic field;
- Scholarly activities such as publishing and presenting at national and international professional conferences;
- Providing practical and useful applications of research to the public sector;
- Developing and updating an academic curriculum that presents theory, practice, and research, both historically and at the cutting edge of professional fields of scholarship;
- Selecting, teaching, advising, and mentoring graduate students; and
- Ongoing assessment and evaluation for quality control, needs of students and the public, and better ways of presenting the academic program.

Different dimensions of faculty engagement in governance, as well as their involvement with strategic planning, resource allocation, and budgeting in both annual and long-term contexts, and program evaluation and assessment can be found in greater detail in Chapter II (which addressed Standards 1, 2, and 3), Chapter III (which addressed Standards 4 and 5), and Chapter VIII (which addresses Standards 11 and 14).

Faculty annually report on their professional activities and accomplishments by submitting updated copies of their Curriculum Vitae to the Office of the Dean. These updates affirm the Faculty of Teachers College, individually and collectively, are actively engaged in a wide variety of learned societies and professional organizations, frequently in leadership positions. They have an impressive record of research and publications, service to professional and scholarly organizations, and recognition for their excellence in fields of education, psychology, and health too numerous to list.

Faculty initiatives are also encouraged and supported at the College. Such endeavors include the communities of practice in Asia and Africa, which were implemented in academic year 2005, the TC Education Partnership Zone, which focuses College resources closer to home—schools in Districts 9 and 10 in Harlem, and the Summer Principals Academy, which trains 45-50 aspiring principals yearly.

During academic year 2004-05, the Office of the Dean, in collaboration with department chairs, undertook a survey of program coordinators. In addition to documenting faculty engagement in program matters—from admission and recruitment to curriculum planning and academic advisement—the survey also provided program coordinators with the opportunity to address, in part, what they believed to be the greatest challenges in completing their programmatic
mission. From this survey, the two responses most frequently seen were the need for more scholarship dollars to attract top students, and the need for more faculty and/or instructor resources to adequately meet program needs. The College has undertaken a Comprehensive Modeling exercise to help address the long-term scholarship need and is immediately seeking to increase the non-restricted pool of Financial Aid through this year’s budget process. In addition, the College remains committed to lowering the student:faculty ratios, as previously indicated, and annually reviews all program ratios, providing increased support when necessary.

In addition to program and course development that takes place at the program level, new academic courses and programs must be reviewed and approved by the Faculty Executive Committee’s Academic Program Committee, which appraises all courses and programs for academic excellence. The review seeks also to eliminate redundancy in Teachers College courses and to ensure that only well-qualified faculty and adjunct faculty teach the courses. Faculty engagement in the development, maintenance, and assessment of the College’s academic program is also discussed under Standards 11 and 14.

Encouragement and Recognition of Multiple Modes of Teaching, Research, and Service, and Opportunities for Professional Development

For many years, the College has had in place more traditional ways of encouraging professional development for its faculty—sabbaticals and funds for development (e.g., research grants) are prime examples. In recent years, however, the faculty and administration have recognized the need for more encouragement regarding professional development and for expanded avenues to realize this need. What follows are the primary examples and avenues for professional development at the College. New ideas for how to encourage and recognize multiple modes of teaching, research, and service are being discussed as well, yet this process is still in its early stages.

Evidence of Teachers College’s support for professional development is abundant. Specifically, funds are provided for attending/presenting at professional meetings and conventions. Professional development funds are provided annually and the amount includes $1,200 for untenured faculty and $1,000 for tenured faculty, which in fiscal year 2005 totaled $166,600.

Additionally, sabbatical leaves to facilitate professional and personal development are granted to full-time faculty when eligible (defined as continuous service for six years). The sabbatical leave is granted in the seventh year and may be one-half academic year on full pay or a full year on half-pay.

The Dean’s Office also provides opportunities for awards and grants for both tenured and untenured faculty, particularly in support of research projects, one of which is overseen by the Faculty Executive Subcommittee on Race, Culture, and Diversity (see call for proposals for grant programs). Finally, the new Office of Policy and Research, established in 2004, provides monetary and related support for faculty research projects, particularly for junior faculty.

With respect to teaching, faculty members are evaluated by students on each course taught, and this feedback provides information for how faculty can improve and develop further
their instructional competencies and overall performance. Highly-rated faculty members receive recognition from the Dean’s Office for their outstanding teaching.

At the department level (and this varies by department), professional development for faculty is provided via mentoring, additional travel funds from the department budget, placing fewer demands on pre-tenured faculty for service activities, the occasional offering of professional development courses, and team teaching.

Finally, our most recent effort is an initiative through the Dean’s Office called the Faculty Development Advisory Committee. This Committee is in charge of monitoring the mentoring plan for the College, and planning and implementing group mentoring activities for the pre-tenured faculty members. In addition, the Committee advises the Dean about faculty development activities for all faculty.

Policies for Student Advisement

Currently, the policy for student advisement for both Master’s and doctoral students is very basic in its requirements. As a result, all programs meet these minimum standards, yet the advising process in action is more ad hoc in nature. Some programs have very explicit policies for advising, while others put the onus on the students to seek advisement.

The Faculty Handbook is the key document that outlines the basic requirements for student advising. Specifically, the official advising policy as stated in the Faculty Handbook states the following (see Faculty Handbook, Section 8, page 5):

Advisement Policy

- Closely linked to faculty’s obligation to assign grades is their obligation to advise students. Office hours for students enrolled in courses must be posted and maintained each semester when a faculty member is teaching; additional office hours for advisees are scheduled by appointment.

- Open course-based office hours must be held for a minimum of three hours, split between days. Additional by-appointment office hours (e.g., for doctoral advisement) are to be scheduled as necessary.

- Adjuncts must hold office hours of one hour for every class which they teach.

- Faculty are expected to be on campus during orientation and in-person registration and provide advisement from 12 noon to 7:00 p.m. During the change-of-program period, advisement must also be available to students. Department chairs need to ensure adequate coverage for registration and change-of-program periods.

Assigning Advisors

- Program coordinators are responsible for assigning advisers to new students regularly.
• Assignments need to be communicated to new students soon after their arrival at Teachers College.

• Program coordinators must ensure that students have access to their advisers as needed.

Since the Faculty Handbook only outlines the basic requirements regarding faculty advisement, further evidence on how the advising process actually occurs within each program was obtained from a survey of program coordinators.

The results from the program coordinator survey revealed that academic advising responsibilities are discharged in a variety of ways across programs and departments. In response to the question “What is your policy for student advising for masters students,” while all program coordinators reported policies or practices for assigning advisors, there was considerable variety among programs. Program size was one factor that introduced additional variability in the approaches to advisement. While smaller programs were somewhat more likely to manage basic program advisement on a one-to-one basis, larger programs used group or seminar venues to address basic or core program requirements. Across all programs, increasing use is made of web-based information. All programs have a policy for assigning advisors which varies from program-to-program. Most programs assign students to faculty advisors and do so based on interest. A few programs have instructor lines assigned to masters-level advising and program planning.

The question “What is your policy for doctoral students?” produced a similarly diverse set of responses. Most programs assign an initial advisor for doctoral students and then trace the development of the students’ research interests and move to facilitating the assignment of a dissertation sponsor for the dissertation proposal as the next stage in the advisement process. A few programs assign advisors at the time of admission; the majority assign an initial advisor while cohort programs often assign group or cohort advisors.

Overall, the evidence revealed that the advisement policy at Teachers College addresses the basic requirements for student advising, yet each program has the ability to develop its own procedure for advisement. The program variability for student advisement surfaces—or reinforces a concern—that some programs provide extensive advisement for students while others provide only the minimum required for student advisement. Additionally, many programs have different practices of advisement for their masters and doctoral students, another possible source for concern.

One of the challenges for that has been identified by many professors is the current policy of developing the course schedule only one semester in advance. This practice does not allow students and faculty to develop long-term advising plans for students since they do not have any knowledge of what courses will be taught the following semester. This is problematic for both full-time and part-time students.

In addition, our large enrollment, coupled with the fact that only faculty provide academic advising, has resulted in major time constraints, causing frustration on the part of both faculty and students, all of whom believe the process needs to be more closely evaluated. A proposal has just been shared with department chairs, suggesting the creation of a professional advising office for all Master’s degree students. Full-time staff would be hired to provide advisement to these students in a systematic and consistent manner. Advisement of doctoral
students would remain with the faculty, allowing them a reduced overall advising load, but also allowing them to focus on providing advisement with doctoral students. This proposal will be discussed in greater detail during the 2006 calendar year. A suggested implementation date for an office of advisement for Master’s students is Fall, 2007.

A larger look at all of the advisement options for students revealed that beyond academic advisement from faculty, students received support and advisement from the orientation program, the Office of Enrollment and Student Services, the Office of Doctoral Students, and the student ombudsman (see Standards 8 and 9 for more details).

Recommendations

One of the greatest strengths of the College is the comprehensiveness and diversity of its academic programs and fields of study. At the same time, many of the challenges the College faces with this standard are functions of the College as a decentralized institution with 9 departments and more than 65 programs of study. Much of academic planning proceeds at the program level, underscoring the need for improved coordination and collaboration across programs and across and within academic departments.

This chapter offers several recommendations in that context: with respect to advisement, undertake a comprehensive audit of advisement policies and practices, including developing mechanisms to assess the actual advisement load of each member; and with those assessment data as a base, develop a set of recommendations to enhance student advisement.

A specific area of concern that connects both the recommendations to improve coordination and collaboration across programs and departments, and those focused on improving academic advisement, is the need to support student academic planning by developing and publishing an accurate course schedule for the entire academic year and summer. The current course schedule is developed and published on a term-by-term basis, and the frequency of changes in the class schedule after publication is very problematic, particularly for part-time students and students seeking to complete program requirements.

Improvements in the information systems used to build course schedules and create more supports and incentives to foster cross-program and cross-department planning are essential.

The review in Chapter VII highlighted practices to assure competitiveness with respect to faculty salaries. In addition to sustaining those practices with faculty salaries, the College needs to undertake a review the compensation of adjuncts, instructors, and lecturers to determine the College’s competitiveness in the market, and then develop and implement, perhaps over several years, a plan to adjust compensation as needed.

The professional development of faculty and instructional staff is supported in a number of ways. The review noted a range of sources and forms of professional development funding. To assure that the funds are used as effectively as possible, we recommend a formal review of all professional development support expenditures, toward the goal of developing recommendations to maximize leverage in order to increase opportunities for professional development.
As a lynchpin in the College’s commitment to realizing a diverse instructional staff, it is essential that the project to update and revise the Affirmative Action Handbook be completed as soon as possible.

Two recent changes to faculty personnel policies and practices have been approved in principle: maternity/paternity leave for faculty, and an early retirement incentive program. Completing the review, development, and implementation for both policies as soon as possible should be a high priority.
CHAPTER VIII: EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

STANDARDS 11 and 14
Assessment of Student Learning and Educational Outcomes

Introduction

As stated in Designs for Excellence, the “assessment of student learning demonstrates that
the institution’s students have the knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional
goals and that students at graduation have achieved appropriate higher education goals.” Since an
integral part of evaluating student learning is related to evaluating the design, content, and
academic rigor of educational offerings, the Steering Committee decided that Standards 11 and 14
should be addressed together. The Subcommittee on Standards 11 and 14 was also charged with
answering the following questions:

- What procedures are in place to ensure that the College’s course offerings meet the
  needs of its students, impart the College’s educational philosophy, and are consistent
  with the mission of the College?

- How does the College assess the progress of its students and the professional
  contribution of its graduates?

This section of our report starts with a brief introduction to the teaching and learning
environment at Teachers College. It also includes general academic requirements for the
programs leading to Master’s and doctoral degrees, and describes a variety of curricular, co-
curricular, and extracurricular learning opportunities available to Master’s and doctoral students.

The Program and Course Approval Processes section describes one of the mechanisms
designed to ensure quality of educational offerings at Teachers College. The results of the
College’s Course Evaluations present evidence from another college-wide mechanism of quality
insurance. They illustrate how student feedback is used to improve courses, to help in the hiring
of adjunct faculty, and even to recognize and reward faculty who have consistently strong
student course evaluations. A discussion also continues on how both the dissemination and
usefulness of the course evaluations could be improved.

A description of Learning Resources and Supports provides a brief overview of the wide
variety of resources, facilities, equipment, and library services that are available to the College’s
students, faculty, and staff in support of teaching, learning, and institutional effectiveness.

The discussion of the Evaluation Philosophy of the College illustrates the conceptual
framework that is used to evaluate its students, and describes how expectations of student
learning are consistent with the mission of the College and the standards of higher education in
the specific disciplines.

A detailed description of the NCATE Assessment Philosophy Conceptual Framework and
Standards serves as a specific illustration of how the general evaluation philosophy of the College
The assessment of student learning is taken extremely seriously at the College. As Teachers College is solely a graduate institution which offers more than 65 individual doctoral/Master’s programs across 9 departments, the assessment of student learning varies, of necessity, depending on the nature and level of the academic program.

Rather than a College-wide assessment plan, where the same sets of standards and measures are used to evaluate all programs, we are currently in the process of implementing a broad-based and comprehensive assessment plan for our school-based programs as part of our recent NCATE review.

The assessment plan developed as part of our recent NCATE self-study applies to 27 areas of study, primarily at the M.A. and Ed.M. level. Other program areas at the College (e.g., psychology, social sciences, health) will be building on the momentum from the NCATE assessment plan and developing more comprehensive assessment plans of their own. In this section, we explain our assessment philosophy, detail the development of the NCATE assessment plan, describe the types of assessments that are currently being conducted at the College, and discuss our current position in the process of moving to a more comprehensive assessment plan.

Overview

By describing the Common Student Level Assessments by Academic Programs, we illustrate the rigor and variety of academic expectations for Master’s and doctoral students.

Based on discussion and analysis, the Subcommittee brought forward two recommendations:

• As a graduate-only institution, the nature of assessment varies widely at Teachers College. The College has not had a “one size fits all” assessment plan except in the broadest sense of the uniform requirements that exist for earning Master’s and doctoral degrees. The NCATE accreditation process has moved the College forward in developing a comprehensive assessment system for teachers and other professional school personnel, but other programs at the College have yet to be put under the same microscope. We recommend that the College build on the momentum generated by the NCATE assessment plan and broaden it to include all of the programs at the College, always keeping in mind the unique characteristics of each program.

• Both students and faculty have concerns about the current course evaluation form and dissemination process. We recommend that the course evaluation form be reviewed and revised, and that the results of the evaluations be more readily available to students so that they can review them when choosing courses.

The assessment of student learning is taken extremely seriously at the College. As Teachers College is solely a graduate institution which offers more than 65 individual doctoral/Master’s programs across 9 departments, the assessment of student learning varies, of necessity, depending on the nature and level of the academic program.

Rather than a College-wide assessment plan, where the same sets of standards and measures are used to evaluate all programs, we are currently in the process of implementing a broad-based and comprehensive assessment plan for our school-based programs as part of our recent NCATE review.

The assessment plan developed as part of our recent NCATE self-study applies to 27 areas of study, primarily at the M.A. and Ed.M. level. Other program areas at the College (e.g., psychology, social sciences, health) will be building on the momentum from the NCATE assessment plan and developing more comprehensive assessment plans of their own. In this section, we explain our assessment philosophy, detail the development of the NCATE assessment plan, describe the types of assessments that are currently being conducted at the College, and discuss our current position in the process of moving to a more comprehensive assessment plan.

VIII-2
Educational Offerings

Teachers College is a graduate and professional school of education, concerned with education in and out of the classroom and across the lifespan. It offers graduate programs leading to advanced degrees—M.A., M.S., Ed.M., Ed.D. or Ph.D.—through the formal, structured pursuit of learning beyond the level of the baccalaureate degree. Graduate studies at Teachers College offer focused study and relevant research of a specialized nature. Students can choose from among more than 65 areas of study which prepare individuals for work in a variety of roles and settings, including schools, universities, clinics, community and governmental agencies, hospitals, community health and mental health centers, and also as professors and scholars who teach in many of these areas. The specialized nature of the academic programs shapes the particular way each of the College’s departments and programs constructs teaching-learning environments, assesses student outcomes, assures equity and diversity, and provides for scholarly access to knowledge.

Teachers College defines the degrees it offers both by identifying the expected student learning and by creating a coherent program of study that leads to the desired outcomes. The College has the responsibility for establishing the requirements for various degrees subject to certain policies set by Columbia University, the New York State Education Department, and professional accrediting agencies. Students have the right to full information regarding these requirements. In brief, the general requirements for degrees awarded by Teachers College are as follows (see Teachers College Catalog, pp. 283-285 for more detail):

- The Master of Arts or Master of Science degree is granted upon the satisfactory completion of no less than 30 points and a formal essay; or 32 points and an acceptable departmental integrative project; or 32 points and successful completion of a departmental comprehensive examination. At least 20 points must be earned in Teachers College courses, and the remaining points can be earned in courses offered within Columbia University departments, no transfer credit from other institutions is permitted. The program for the Master of Arts must include a minimum of 12 points in the major field courses; the program for the Master of Science must include at least 20 points in science courses and related technical fields. In order to broaden the student’s background, three Teachers College courses outside the Teachers College major department must be completed. Other requirements include either a formal essay, a comprehensive examination or an integrative project. The formal essay must demonstrate the ability of the student to select, organize, and present the results of professional investigation in the major field.

- The Master of Education degree is awarded upon satisfactory completion of a minimum of 60 points of graduate work, 30 of which must be completed while matriculated as an Ed.M. student at Teachers College. A minimum of 18 points must be competed in Teachers College courses (rather than other departments or schools of the University). Candidates admitted to the Ed.M. program are required to take a minimum of three Teachers College courses in education outside the major program.

1 The degree of Master of Philosophy (M. Phil.) is awarded by Columbia University students who are enrolled in Ph.D. programs at the point in their program of studies when all requirements for the Ph.D. have been completed, with the exception of the dissertation.
Additionally, a formal essay, a departmental comprehensive examination or a special department integrative project is required.

- The degree of Doctor of Education emphasizes broad preparation for advanced professional responsibilities through a program based upon extensive study in a specialized branch of the field of education or in an area of instruction. Special programs leading to the degree of Doctor of Education for persons preparing for college teaching of an academic subject are offered in several departments. These programs emphasize broad preparation in the candidate’s major field, specialized competence in a limited area within that field, and an understanding of the broader problems of education, especially at the college level. The minimum requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education are: satisfactory completion of a planned program of 90 points of graduate course work beyond the Bachelor’s degree (at least 45 points of which must be taken through Teachers College registration); submission of a statement of total program; satisfactory performance on a departmental Certification Examination; and the preparation and defense of a dissertation.

- The degree of Doctor of Philosophy emphasizes research and intensive specialization in a field of scholarship. Under an agreement with Columbia University, Teachers College offers programs leading to the Ph.D. degree in designated fields in which the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of the University does not offer programs, namely in education, including education in the substantive disciplines and certain applied areas of psychology. The minimum requirements for the degree are: satisfactory completion of a planned program of 75 graduate points beyond the Baccalaureate; submission of a statement of total program; either satisfactory performance on a foreign language examination or, in some program instances, acceptable evidence of a research tool proficiency such as use of statistics or computer applications; satisfactory performance on a departmental Certification Examination; and the preparation and defense of a research dissertation.

Design, implementation, and evaluation of program curriculum in specialized areas of study fall within the responsibility of the program faculty. In doing so, they use the latest research and developments in their fields, follow the general degree regulations established by Teachers College and Columbia University, and adhere to professional standards and state guidelines where applicable. Each program curriculum is built around a core of courses considered to be essential to an exemplary practice in the field. Beyond the core, students along with their advisors have the flexibility to design individual programs that meet particular needs and goals. The student’s advisor is responsible for approval of the academic program of the individual student within the framework of the established policies of the department and the College, including the student’s program of coursework for each academic term. The Teachers College Faculty ensures that educational programs and curricula exhibit sufficient content, rigor, and depth.

Educational offerings within programs at Teachers College provide a range of courses leading to professional competencies commensurate with the requirements of the graduate degree, as stipulated generally by the College and specifically within the department where the degree is offered. The succession of required courses is published in the Teachers College Catalogue at the beginning of each program section. Program guidelines are distributed within
the departments. All programs offer introductory courses (typically at the 4000 level) that provide a conceptual and contextual background for the area of study. For the M.A., M.S., and Ed.M. degrees, a progression of 4000- or 5000-level courses leads to a formal essay or an integrative project that provides evidence of mastery of the content relevant to the discipline and/or area of professional practice. This requirement is uniformly adopted across the College and compliant with New York State requirements. For doctoral degrees, the course sequence leads to advanced research courses and seminars, including a 7000-level doctoral seminar. The Office of Doctoral Studies ensures that all students who are certified to complete the doctoral degree have completed this course. In addition to the doctoral dissertation, all programs require completion of a Certification Examination that provides evidence of competencies in researching the literature, the ability to synthesize information relevant to the student’s disciplinary focus, and the capacity to think critically and reflectively about the subject domain.

Individual courses, programs, and sequences of study are dynamic and responsive to new research findings and modes of inquiry. Besides the traditional classroom and/or laboratory courses, in which basic knowledge, theory, and research findings are presented and discussed, course formats also provide for a range of experiences, including small seminars focused on new issues or knowledge, on student and/or faculty research or on field experience, colloquia, school or clinic “cases,” field trips and internships in formal and informal environments, innovative online courses, and the like. Teachers College courses provide for a range of learning venues consistent with the maturity of its students. While all courses must meet the mandated time within the formal learning environment and for preparation outside of the classroom, our higher-level courses provide for individualized study, small-group problem solving, project-based learning, and seminar formats where the emphasis is on scholarly discussion and analysis of major theoretical, conceptual, and professional topics in the discipline. Moreover, a range of learning experiences that are field-based or encourage individualized scholarly endeavors are provided, including internships in professional settings, independent study under the guidance of a faculty mentor, and specialized seminars for cohorts of graduate students pursuing research in similar areas of scholarship. Some of the latter are supported by research funds, either as externally-funded grants to faculty or through internal grants (such as the Spencer Foundation Institutional Grant) that support innovative approaches to preparing Ph.D. students in education and cognate professional fields. Fieldwork, practica, supervised student teaching experiences, and internships are required components of all professional preparation programs. Internships, student teaching, other field placements, and field trips extend the classroom into the real world.

Teachers College Master’s and doctoral students are offered a variety of educational opportunities outside the formal program curriculum. The teaching/learning environment also encompasses a number of clinics, centers, and institutes in which advanced graduate students, under the direct faculty supervision, render services to community members. Additionally, students frequently work in research teams with faculty members, co-author and present their research and findings at professional meetings, and engage in community projects that foster Teacher College’s mission on educational equity. The range and mix of teaching/learning experiences are quite rich and varied, and reflect the commitment of the faculty and academic programs to developing critical thinkers and reflective practitioners. Each of the departments offer courses that extend the students’ conceptual knowledge in their discipline to ensure that our

---

2A list of Research Centers, Institutes, and Clinics will be Available in the Resource Room.

VIII-5
graduates have a sound grasp of domain specific knowledge in addition to professional skills and proficiencies specific to their field of practice.

The great variety of co-curricular and extracurricular activities, as well as the numerous resources of Columbia University and New York City, offer students additional opportunities to enrich their academic preparation and professional development. Each year, Teachers College offers and hosts a variety of events such as weekend and summer institutes, seminars and colloquia, professional conferences and workshops, lectures and lecture series, book talks and movie screenings, music recitals and arts exhibitions.3

Many of these educational offerings are directly focused on the institutional mission of promoting educational equity. The College invites long- and short-term visiting scholars and lecturers to present on topics of diversity, educational opportunity, and equity. These activities translate into increased opportunities for students to appreciate human diversity and learn new strategies in assessment, pedagogy, curriculum, and professional practice. Annual lectures by highly respected thinkers and scholars are one example of such activities. Another example is the Mellon Visiting Minority Scholar Program, which brought minority scholars to the Teachers College campus each year through 2005. The scholars co-taught classes, lead small discussion groups with faculty and students, consulted on ongoing research, and participated in public panels and debates.

Teachers College’s policies and procedures provide appropriate consideration for the individual student who has changed institutions or objectives. In its articulation and transfer policies, Teachers College judges courses, programs, and other learning experiences on their learning outcomes and the existence of valid evaluation measures. As stated in the Teachers College Catalog, only graduate courses which have been (1) completed with grades of B or higher, (2) submitted on an official transcript from a regionally-accredited institution, and (3) granted/assigned credit on the transcript of that institution may be considered for transfer credit. For the Master of Education and Doctor of Philosophy degrees, a maximum of 30 points completed outside of Teachers College may be transferred; for the Doctor of Education degree, a maximum of 45 points may be transferred. Students enrolled in a 60-point Master of Science program may transfer a maximum of 30 points. No transfer credit is awarded for Master of Arts students.

Students who seek approval of prior graduate coursework as transfer credit must submit an application form and include copies of the appropriate official transcripts. A list of potentially approved courses is sent by the Registrar’s Office to the Program Coordinator within the student’s department, and only those courses that meet the requirements for the degree and are approved by the Program Coordinator or designated faculty advisor are accepted for transfer.

Program and Course Approval Processes

The mission and goals of each academic program are described in the Teachers College Catalog. Admission and degree requirements as well as core courses are also described in the Catalog. All new program proposals and proposals to revise existing programs are required to undergo a review by the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) Academic Program Subcommittee.

3Information detailing a representative sample of Teachers College 2005-06 events, including annual lecture series and events related to the Mellon Visiting Minority Scholar Program, will be available in the Resource Room.
A new/revised program proposal needs to address the following sections: program description (including mission and goals), core courses, relation to existing programs, staffing needs, student implications, evaluation plan, market for program, and budget and resources. The FEC Academic Program Subcommittee carefully reviews program proposals using the Rubric for Submission of New or Revised Program. The Subcommittee’s review and approval is the first mechanism in ensuring the quality of Teachers College’s educational offerings. To foster continuous program improvement, the faculty who propose developing a new program are required to present an evaluation plan that demonstrates that the program is accomplishing its missions and goals, and to provide evidence regarding student enrollment, rate of program completion, and job placement. Program faculty and academic departments periodically evaluate the effectiveness of the programs.

Besides internal mechanisms for program evaluation and improvement, individual programs are responsible for ensuring that academic programs are in compliance with the New York State Department of Education regulations, NCATE standards, guidelines developed by the Columbia University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, and accreditation requirements from various professional bodies (e.g., APA—American Psychological Association, ASHA—American Speech and Hearing Association, etc.). Periodic paper or on-site reviews conducted by these outside agencies have demonstrated that Teachers College programs meet all standards and requirements.

The quality of educational offerings is also ensured at the individual course level through course approval mechanisms and formal course evaluations. To add a new course to the College master list of approved courses, the Faculty of Teachers College have created a layered review process. All new course proposals must be accompanied by a detailed rationale for a new course and approved by the faculty of the program and the department from which it originates, before it is submitted to the Registrar for initial vetting and then to the Academic Program Subcommittee, where it is reviewed and either approved or rejected. All approved courses are given one-time approval. Permanent approval can be sought only after the course has been successfully taught and student evaluation forms are provided as evidence of its success. The Academic Program Subcommittee examines all new course proposals to determine the appropriateness of the offerings relative to the College mission, existing degree programs and their required curricula, the expertise of the faculty who will teach the course(s), and the adequacy and completeness of the proposed syllabi for the new course(s). The proposed courses can be rejected because of too little information or insufficient resources to support the academic content, incomplete syllabi, redundancy or lack of compelling evidence to support the described need for the new course. The multi-layered course review process ensures the quality and viability of academic courses.

All courses offered by the College must be accompanied by a course syllabus. This is a required item for initial course approval, as stated above, and all faculty are asked to submit updated copies of course syllabi to the Department Academic Administrator annually. Each course syllabus should include the following information: course purpose, ADA statement, inclusion of academic requirements justifying 2/3 points, description of reading and activities.

---

4 Copies of forms for New Course and New Program Proposals are provided in the Faculty Handbook.

5 Copies of the forms for both one-time and permanent approval of new courses are included in the Faculty Handbook.
and methods and standards for evaluation of students (requirements for satisfactory completion of the course and relative weight assigned to each requirement in making an overall evaluation).

Course Evaluations

Course evaluations are another College-wide mechanism designed to ensure the quality of Teachers College’s educational offerings. The College has had a common course evaluation form since Autumn 1991. Participation is now required of adjuncts and instructors, and the vast majority of full-time faculty also have their courses evaluated. Results are distributed to students through the library. During the Fall, 2004, 453 classes were evaluated.

Since their inception, the results of the course evaluation forms have been extremely positive. The table below presents the results for Fall, 2004 (results from the Fall, 2005, administration of course evaluations are not available at this date). From term to term, the results vary little. Analysis has shown that the most central item on the survey is “I would recommend the instructor to other students.” In a given year, the average score on this item tends to be between 1.6 and 1.7⁶—in other words, firmly between “strongly agree” and “agree.” The median tends to be even closer to “strongly agree” with values between 1.4 and 1.5 in most terms. The evaluations have come to be used as an important part of the tenure review process for faculty, and are frequently consulted in hiring decisions about adjunct faculty. Class size accounts for some variability in course evaluations as smaller courses are consistently evaluated more positively. As a way of publicly recognizing exceptional teaching, the Dean’s Office annually makes awards to several instructors with outstanding student course evaluations.

A commonly expressed view regarding course evaluation results is that classes that are easy receive better evaluations and that good evaluations may not directly correlate with student learning. A closer look at the results, however, suggests that students take the forms seriously and are not just rewarding instructors of classes that are easy with positive evaluations. Term after term, the results have indicated that classes where more work is required outside of class are evaluated significantly more highly than those where less work is required.

Currently, the results of the course evaluations are available on reserve in the library and in the Office of Institutional Studies. The Student Senate has expressed displeasure that the results are not more readily available and has initiated discussion with the Faculty Executive Committee about making the evaluation results readily available online. Some of the faculty have voiced concerns that the current evaluation form is too generic and does not accommodate the variety of instructional modes and course types, and that the form may need to be revised or multiple types of forms used. Just recently, course evaluations became required for summer courses and were initially piloted using an online version of the form. This Spring, the College will convene a review committee comprised of faculty and student representatives to review the course evaluation form and process at the College.

---

⁶Course evaluations use a five-point scale, with 1 = “Strongly Agree” and 5 = “Strongly Disagree.”
### Table 8.1. Fall, 2004, Course Evaluations: Overall Mean and Median Scores\(^7\) on Each Item
\((\text{N}=453 \text{ courses})\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class presentations were clear and straightforward.</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor well-prepared, class well-organized</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials presented on appropriate level</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor encouraged independent thinking</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples were used to relate theory to practice</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter was up-to-date</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class atmosphere was conducive to learning</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter was presented in interesting way</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate opportunities were provided for asking questions</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class discussions were well-managed</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active student participation was encouraged</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor was responsive to student comments</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments were reasonable in quantity and quality</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading assignments contributed to my understanding</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient opportunities to evaluate my learning</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor provides prompt feedback on written work</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluations reflected course objectives</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students treated in fair and equal way</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend course to students</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend instructor to students</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor treated students with respect</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor was accessible outside of class</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned a lot in this class</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(7\) Course evaluations use a five-point scale, with 1 = “Strongly Agree” and 5 = “Strongly Disagree.”
Learning Resources and Supports

Teachers College strives to provide students and instructors with the knowledge, skills, and tools to obtain information in many formats and media. The College provides sufficient learning resources, facilities, instructional equipment, and library services to support faculty teaching and student learning.

As described in Chapter III, with respect to Standard 5, Teachers College has invested intensively in technological upgrades of its academic, office, and residential facilities. Computer resources have improved dramatically over the past 10 years. The Computer Information Services is responsible for academic and administrative computing, media services, the campus data, voice and video network, and telecommunications. These services include e-mail, course Web pages, desktop computers, student laboratories, multi-media classrooms, audio-visual services, management information systems, telephone and satellite and video-conferencing connections, and residential cable television. More extensive information may be found at the Computing and Information Resources pages of TCWeb: www.tc.columbia.edu/cis.

While upgrading the network and computing equipment, the College has also undertaken to substantially increase the use of networked communication and online resources to enhance teaching and learning across the curriculum. TC ClassWeb is a user-friendly course environment that is based on the George Washington University Prometheus product. Instructor and enrollment information for all credit courses in the schedule of classes is refreshed nightly. ClassWeb provides an array of course management functions, including syllabi, threaded discussions, file sharing, and e-mail. Access to the TC ClassWeb is provided through MyTC Portal, which also provides College-wide announcements, candidate and faculty profiles, and collaborative tools for groups based on affinities other than class membership. The library has implemented electronic reserves integrated with ClassWeb as well as electronic document delivery.

A pro-active faculty training effort for ClassWeb includes e-mail to all instructors prior to each semester announcing system enhancements and the schedule of workshops on its use. Annual surveys and interviews with instructors and students have been used to gauge its growing use and to identify modifications that might be made. Results of a recent survey of students show that over 75% use ClassWeb, with the average use close to twice weekly. Students have made extensive use of web-based and TouchTone access to registration, grade inquiry, and credit card payment. More than 90% of all registration/drop/add transactions are performed this way. Plans are in place to enhance advising by enabling faculty to have web-based access to their students’ academic histories.

Given the varied backgrounds and experience levels in technology use that faculty and students bring, a multi-pronged approach is used to provide professional development and support. In addition to ClassWeb training, both Academic Computing and the Library provide a wide range of hands-on workshops that are open to faculty, candidates, and staff every semester. CIS training workshops are scheduled throughout the year on the use of electronic mail, word processing, spreadsheets, the Internet and Web publishing, statistical analysis, photo and video
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8Copies of the Computing Services Survey and summaries of data collected through those surveys are available in the Resource Room. Information detailing the technology workshops offered through CIS is also available.
manipulation, and multimedia authoring. Individual consulting is available to students and faculty for both high-end and low-end applications of technology.

The availability and accessibility of adequate learning resources, such as library services and the support of professional staff qualified by education, training, and experience, are essential to academic quality, student learning, teaching performance, and institutional effectiveness. The recently renovated Gottesman Libraries house one of the nation’s largest and most comprehensive collections in American elementary and secondary education, and in such subject areas as psychology (particularly applied psychology), educational administration, the history and philosophy of education, guidance, special education, higher and adult education, speech and language pathology and audiology, health and nursing education, nutrition, curriculum and teaching, communications and computing technology, recreation, and international and comparative education. Research resources in print, non-print, and electronic formats include all important reference works, a wide selection of monographs, extensive journals, and major indexing and abstracting services.

The Gottesman Libraries provides a full range of research and teaching support services for the students and faculty of Teachers College. The staff of over 20 full-time professionals, including 6 professional librarians, is joined by over 35 part-time students, most of whom are pursuing doctoral degrees. Beginning in Spring, 2006, these staff members will be supplemented by a virtual reference team of specialized librarians who will provide online services to students and faculty 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. Students and faculty of Teachers College also have access to the resources of the entire Columbia University library system.

The library is organized into five service teams:

- **Research and Information Services** provide educational offerings within the building, in classrooms throughout the College, and remotely on the phone and online. These services include workshops, tutorials, and course-specific instruction. Assistance is provided to meet the needs of faculty and students in both research and teaching.

- **Content Delivery Services** respond to all faculty requests for materials for research and course reserves through a digital desktop delivery system. Requests are answered through retrieval of materials from any of the Columbia libraries, through digital subscriptions, interlibrary loan, and special on-demand purchases. Student requests for materials not held by the library are addressed in similar fashion.

- **The Media Design Center** works with faculty, students, and staff to design and produce a range of educational materials in all media, including print, audio, and video. Services are offered in both self-help and assisted modes.

- **The Teaching Support Group** works with faculty to develop courses, workshops, and other instructional experiences both on campus and online. The group also serves as a point of contact for individuals and groups with teaching expertise throughout the campus.

- **The Collaborative Solutions Group** provides support to diverse groups engaged in collaborative knowledge work. The group creates resources to assist students
working on group course projects, offers facilitation services for all groups meeting in
the library, and provides goal-centered consulting services to aid the collaboration
activities of academic and administrative groups throughout the College.

Teachers College as a graduate school has traditionally served adult learners, a
population whose learning needs differ from those of traditional full-time or residential students.
The College has always demonstrated flexibility and sensitivity by developing institutional
policies and practices that are appropriate to and supportive of adult learners. To accommodate
adult (older and employed full-time) learners, the majority of Teachers College courses are
offered in the evenings and on the weekends. A number of programs have developed special
intensive summer programs. For example, the INSTEP programs are designed for in-service
teachers who take the majority of required courses for an M.A. degree over three summers. The
Summer Principals Academy is another example. Here, aspiring school leaders pursue
coursework and skills development at Teachers College over two summers and undertake site-
based research projects and internships at their schools of employment during the intervening
year. The cohort program allows them to balance full-time employment with graduate study.

Teachers College combines a large number of part-time and full-time students who are
very active in professional education circles and either commute or live on campus. A variety of
student services and organizations at the College are designed to support students’ programs of
study, provide professional development opportunities, foster community, and celebrate diversity
(see our response to Standard 9 for a detailed account of Student Services).

Evaluation Philosophy

Graduate education, while building on the foundation provided through the
undergraduate experience, is fundamentally different in significant and important ways.
Graduate students are obviously more mature in age and cognitive development. They come
with the advantage of some knowledge of the norms, expectations, and academic requirements of
higher education. Most who come to Teachers College have a clear perspective on their
intellectual and professional goals; they come largely to prepare for a professional role or to
improve their competence as a professional, either within or outside of academia. Although
Teachers College is recognized as the “graduate professional education school” of Columbia
University, our clientele is much more diverse and the programs of study that we offer are far
more varied than other graduate schools of education. Historically, and presently, Teachers
College prepares practitioners and researchers in a wide range of disciplines that are grounded in
scholarly perspectives informing educational practice (in the broadest sense), including
sociology, psychology, philosophy, policy, and health sciences.

Since graduate education is often highly specialized, and our students represent a wide
spectrum of intellectual and professional interests, evaluation practices across the College vary in
detail, but are grounded in some fundamental philosophical stances that are respected across the
College.

First, evaluation should provide evidence of the accomplishments and achievements of
students in relation to the overarching mission of the College and the specific goals and standards
of excellence in the program of study in which they have enrolled. In some cases, in addition to
program-specific assessment practices, students take tests administered by certification or credential-granting authorities (e.g., Regents of New York State for teacher certification, or competency examinations administered by national accrediting associations within a profession, including applied psychology, health, and related fields).

Second, evaluation in a graduate school, particularly a graduate school with a substantial commitment to professional preparation, should be designed to provide periodic evidence of progress toward the intellectual and professional goals of the students at appropriate points in the students’ progress, thus providing sequential measures of scholarly and professional maturation over the course of graduate studies.

Third, the assessment should go beyond evaluation of accomplishments and, at appropriate points in the students’ progress, provide evidence of what further academic work is needed to help the students realize successful completion of a program of study—assuming evidence is sufficient to encourage the students to continue as graduate students within the College.

Fourth, while individual practices may vary across programs within the College, there should be a codified set of evaluation steps that all students are required to complete, thus ensuring that a uniform set of evidence is obtained for all students who enroll for graduate degrees in the College.

Within this philosophical framework, we have gathered evidence of how educational outcomes are assessed at Teachers College by summarizing the College-wide evaluation practices that are adopted by all departments in the College, and by noting some of the individual differences within programs that exist across the College reflecting the particular ways each program addresses the unique needs of its student clientele. The most formal and comprehensive assessment takes place in our school-based programs, which recently successfully completed their NCATE review.

Developing the NCATE Assessment Philosophy Conceptual Framework and Standards

As part of the recent NCATE review, Teachers College developed a conceptual framework for a comprehensive assessment system covering the 27 programs that prepare teachers and other professional school personnel. The development of this conceptual framework took place over a semester of discussions with Teachers College Faculty, organized through the collaborative efforts of the Teacher Education Policy Committee (TEPC) and the Teachers College Accreditation Team (TCAT). The process allowed for broad reflection by the teacher education faculty and other interested faculty who offer foundation courses. The TEPC comprises representatives from all nine departments as well as representatives from most of the programs across the College that focus on the preparation of teachers and other school professionals.

Numerous meetings, reviews, and working sessions were used to refine concepts and work toward identifying the three stances that form the pillars of the conceptual framework. Because the conceptual framework should be viewed as an evolving document, we expect that it will continue to be refined and elaborated as it receives wider circulation in the Teachers College community.
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9A copy of the Institutional Report prepared for our NCATE evaluation visit will be available in the Resource Room.
The framework is based on the College’s long tradition as a leading intellectual influence on the development of the teaching profession, serving the needs of urban and suburban schools in the United States and around the world. The mission of teacher education at Teachers College is to establish and maintain programs of study, service, and research that prepare competent, caring, and qualified professional educators (teachers, counselors, psychologists, administrators, and others). This mission is based on three shared philosophical stances that underlie and infuse the work we do:

- **Inquiry stance:** We are an inquiry-based and practice-oriented community. We and our students and graduates challenge assumptions and complacency, and embrace a stance of inquiry toward the interrelated roles of learner, teacher, and leader in P-12 schools.

- **Curricular stance:** Negotiating among multiple perspectives on culture, content, and context, our graduates strive to meet the needs of diverse learners, both students and other adults, in their school communities.

- **Social justice stance:** Our graduates choose to collaborate across differences in and beyond their school communities to demonstrate a commitment to social justice and to serving the world while imagining its perspectives.

Teachers College’s conceptual framework and its three philosophical stances—Inquiry, Curriculum, and Social Justice—provide the context for developing and assessing candidates’ proficiencies based on professional, state, and institutional standards. The five Teachers College Standards are:

- **Standard 1—Inquirers and Reflective Practitioners (Inquiry Stance):** Our candidates are inquirers/researchers who have a breadth of knowledge and a variety of tools to ask questions about educational environments. They reflect on and continually evaluate the effects of their choices on others (children, families, and other professionals in the learning community).

- **Standard 2—Lifelong Learners (Inquiry Stance):** Our candidates are continuously engaged in learning and research. They take responsibility for their professional growth and seek/create learning opportunities for themselves and others.

- **Standard 3—Learner-Centered Educators/Professionals (Curriculum Stance):** Our candidates understand subject matter/discipline; learners and learning; and curriculum and teaching, and can create learning experiences that foster learning, development, and achievement in all students.

- **Standard 4—Effective Collaborators (Social Justice Stance):** Our candidates actively participate in the community or communities of which they are a part to support children’s learning and well-being.

- **Standard 5—Advocates of Social Justice and Diversity (Social Justice Stance):** Our candidates are familiar with legal, ethical, and policy issues, and take a leadership role in advocating for children, families, and themselves in a variety of professional, political, and policymaking contexts.
The programs covered by this assessment plan are a wide range of specialty areas: early childhood, teaching of elementary and secondary schools subjects, special education, school psychology, school counseling, and educational leadership. Both the number and the variety of programs challenged the development of a unified assessment system, and an assessment plan team was established to accomplish this task. The team included one faculty member with expertise in evaluation and assessment, one faculty member with expertise in educational technology, the TCAT Faculty Leader, the TCAT Project Coordinator, the Associate Dean of Teacher Education, the Director of the Office of Institutional Studies, and the Director of Information Technology. The team has identified and analyzed the current candidate, program, and unit-level assessments and developed a process for aligning the College’s assessment system with institutional, state, and national standards. Data are currently being collected under this system as the first cohorts to be evaluated under it pass through the College.

While this assessment plan covers only roughly one-third of the students at the College, it is hoped that other College programs will follow suit in developing appropriate assessment plans. While the specific philosophies and standards used by the teacher preparation programs (and required by NCATE) may not be perfect fits for other programs at the College, and the degree of specificity may not be needed for all programs, the processes and framework can be used as a model to expand our assessment efforts and create a more uniform design. Toward that goal, the Dean recently outlined a participatory action research project that will bring faculty and students across health-related programs together to develop a Health Conceptual Framework that would unite faculty and students across a range of health-related programs around a common, inclusive, and understood mission. In turn, from that shared mission performance expectations, assessment measures, and admission criteria will be developed, which both align with the purposes of the health-related programs while also recognizing and rewarding the diversity of faculty and student achievement. The development of a health conceptual framework will also assist the College in program and course alignment. The next phase of this project will focus on developing a conceptual framework for the more than 15 psychology and psychology-related programs offered at the College.

College-Level Assessment of Student Learning: Retention and Time to Degree

Teachers College data on time to degree and retention tend to compare favorably to the available national data. The median time required to earn a doctorate at Teachers College is 6 years. The national median is over 8 years for all doctorate degrees that are earned in the field of education, so Teachers College doctoral students earn their degrees considerably more quickly than the national average. The median for M.A. students is 1.7 years, while both M.S. and Ed.M. students take approximately 2 years. National figures on Master’s time to degree are not available.

Time to degree tends to vary significantly by program. One program with a typically shorter time to the doctorate is the Inquiry Program in Educational Leadership (slightly less than 5 years on average). This program provides a structured cohort-based alternative for doctoral study. Doctorates in Counseling Psychology, on the other hand, typically take 7 or 8 years. Variation in the time taken to earn Master’s degrees is less pronounced by program, though students in Higher and Post-secondary Education, the Teaching of English, General and Applied Psychology, and Health Education do tend to complete their studies more quickly, reflecting programs of study that are either more likely to be pursued full-time or have fewer requirements.
Patterns of Student Retention at Teachers College That Vary by Degree Level

- Over two-thirds of M.A. and M.S. students earn the degree within 2 years. After 5 years, approximately 85% of M.A. and M.S. students have earned their degrees. The large majority of M.A. and M.S. attrition occurs within the first year.

- Retention patterns for Ed.M. students are peculiar. About 45% of the students receive an Ed.M. degree within 5 years. Another 29% had earned either an M.A. or M.S. degree and were no longer enrolled. Overall, nearly three-fourths of those who started in Ed.M. programs earned their degrees within 5 years.

- After 5 years, 37% of doctoral students earned the doctorate, 34% were actively enrolled and pursuing the degree, and 5% earned a Master’s degree and were no longer enrolled. After 5 years, over 70% of doctoral students had either earned their degree or were still enrolled. After 10 years, nearly 60% of doctoral students earned the doctorate and a handful are still enrolled. The bulk of the attrition for doctoral students occurs during the first year. In a typical year, over 85% of the entering Fall cohort returns to enroll for the following Fall.

Retention figures for graduate education degrees, or for graduate degrees in general, are not readily available nationally. While the Higher Education Amendments require all colleges to report detailed retention records for undergraduate students, graduate students were excluded. No other agency appears to be collecting national data. Although the national Survey of Earned Doctorates reports time to degree data for all doctorates, they do not track student cohorts to monitor retention. Retention for graduate students is difficult to define in a uniform fashion, due in part to students switching between doctoral and Master’s status, the preponderance of part-time students, and the typically lengthy time it takes a student to earn a doctorate.

A few significant differences exist in time to degree and retention rates by demographic category. Women and men earn degrees at similar rates and in a similar amount of time. African American students do take somewhat longer to earn M.A. degrees (typically 2 years rather than 1.7), perhaps because they are more likely to be enrolled part-time at the start of their academic career.

Licensure Exams

One way to assess our success in preparing students is by looking at the results of licensure exams. By far, the most common form of this assessment among our graduates are the New York State teaching certification exams. Annually, roughly 400 students taking these exams have maintained a pass rate of over 99%.

The Student Satisfaction Survey

Every academic year between 1992-93 and 2003-04, the Student Satisfaction Survey\textsuperscript{10} was distributed to a random sample of half of all enrolled degree students. For the first time in 2004-05, the survey was distributed to all students in an online format, resulting in a much more

\textsuperscript{10}The results of the Student Satisfaction Survey for the past several years will be available in the Resource Room.
robust sample of responses. The primary purpose of the survey is to gauge how students feel they are being served by Teachers College. The focus of the survey is primarily on academic issues, but it also addresses general student life issues.

A number of questions on the survey are related to academic issues, and the results of the survey show that, by and large, students are very satisfied with their academic programs. Most important, students feel they have learned a great deal, think very highly of faculty and fellow students, feel that the College has a strong reputation, and believe that it is an intellectually stimulating place in which to study.

When students are asked to name the one thing about Teachers College that they are most pleased with, faculty quality has topped the list by a wide margin for every year that the survey has been given. Over one-third of all students have identified faculty as “the best thing” about Teachers College in each year that the survey has been given. All of the other top-five items on the list also positively refer to the quality of education at Teachers College. Fellow students, effective academic programs, and quality courses all serve to enhance the students’ academic experience at the College. While positive overall, students are somewhat less positive in their rating of their opportunities for interaction with faculty outside the classroom. This includes both the quality and availability of academic advising.

The ratings of academic life at Teachers College have been relatively stable since the onset of the survey, but in the past three years, a notable improvement has been made on all of the academic items on the survey. The largest improvements have occurred for the items related to faculty/advisor availability, but these items are still rated slightly below the other academic items.

Some statistically significant differences also appear in satisfaction by demographic group. Though the differences are small, Master’s students at Teachers College tend to be somewhat more satisfied with their academic experiences than doctoral students. This is, in part, because new students, who tend to be significantly more satisfied, make up a much smaller percentage of the total doctoral student population. African American students are slightly less satisfied with their academic experiences, but more satisfied with the admissions/orientation process. Asian American students tend to be slightly less satisfied with both academic and administrative areas. Students living in college housing are more satisfied with administrative areas and the library, but have similar levels of satisfaction with academic issues as commuters.

Exit and Alumni Surveys

A historic weakness in the College’s assessment efforts has been the lack of College-wide exit and alumni surveys that provide useful assessment data. At the time of graduation, each doctoral graduate completes the national Survey of Earned Doctorates, an extensive survey that asks them about their college experience and post-graduation plans. The survey is made available to the College by the National Opinion Research Center. While this survey provides a range of data that help to construct a descriptive profile of earned doctorates at the College, the survey provides little assessment information regarding the students’ academic experience. While some programs have surveyed their alumni to identify graduates’ perceptions regarding the extent to which their programs prepared them for their chosen career (all of the Psychology programs, Math Education, Science Education, Speech and Language Pathology, and Arts
Administration, for example), and other programs monitor the job placement of their graduates, a comprehensive effort to monitor the preparedness of our graduates is still lacking.

As part of the NCATE review, the College piloted an exit survey during the 2003-04 academic year. This survey was generalized and expanded in 2004-05 to include graduates from all programs at the College. It was designed to obtain information on student satisfaction with various aspects of their experience at Teachers College, including curriculum, internships, learning opportunities, the learning environment, faculty, diversity, and the resources and supports provided. In an overall evaluation of their educational experiences at Teachers College, 79% of the respondents agreed they were satisfied, and 83% agreed that Teachers College prepared them well for future professional work. At least 75% of the respondents held positive views of the following:

- the scholarly and professional competency of the faculty;
- the scholarly and professional promise of students;
- the contribution of the internship to professional development;
- the opportunities to practice professional skills during the internship;
- certain aspects of faculty teaching;
- certain aspects of learning environment;
- faculty interest in students’ welfare and professional development; and
- student support for each other.

Students had less positive views towards their opportunities to learn how to use technology in a professional context, use relevant technologies during their internship, and participate in department/program decision-making. They were also less positive about their ability to obtain academic and career advising and information.

The College is in the process of building on this exit survey by sending a similar survey to students who graduated two and five years ago (using 2005 as a baseline) This survey draws some of its questions from the exit survey, but has additional questions about how these alumni felt their academic program had prepared them for their profession. These surveys are slated to be sent out during the Spring of 2006.

Common Student-Level Assessments by Academic Programs

M.A., M.Ed., and M.S. degrees. Programs of study leading to certification for teaching comply with the requirements of the New York State Regents and NCATE standards. All departments reported that, in addition to fulfilling the course requirements, they require some form of integrative project that provides evidence of mastery of the subject matter in the program specialization within the department. The form of the integrative project is most typically a written essay or research project submitted as a written report (in some cases, suitable for publication). In areas where technology or the arts was the specialization, options are provided for the integrative project to be a portfolio containing evidence of professional competence such as works of art, digital learning products designed and produced by the student or other products.
produced during the course of studies for the degree and provide evidence of growth in professional competence. In all cases, the departments stated that the quality of the work was judged by the faculty, either a committee or by the sponsor. In one program, the students were allowed to submit a written examination for the M.A. degree and also enroll in a research course within their area of specialization, but this was atypical.

Ed.D. and Ph.D. All departments report that in addition to satisfactory completion of the degree course requirements, doctoral students must complete a written certification examination that typically consists of at least two parts. One part may focus on the theoretical and practical aspects of the subject domain in their specialization, and the other part includes assessment of research competence, knowledge of the research literature, and/or evidence of ability to design and evaluate research projects. Some programs may have an additional oral examination in which the student defends the written examination. In some cases, the student is given a choice of two questions from a range of questions, while in other cases, the questions are specified for each portion of the examination. The format of the examination varies among departments: some require that students take a sit-down examination at a specified time and place; others use a take-home examination with a definite time period for preparation and submission of the examination. However, all departments require a written document to be submitted as part of the certification process. In some clinical-based programs, an additional requirement is made that the students submit a case study report as part of the certification process. In all cases, the faculty of the department in which the student is enrolled evaluates the examination and required reports. Upon recommendation of the department faculty, a doctoral student is approved as a certified doctoral candidate by the respective doctoral committee (Ed.D. or Ph.D.).

All departments require that doctoral candidates complete a thesis proposal that must be approved by the faculty, write a scholarly dissertation using inquiry techniques relevant to their field of specialization, and successfully defend the thesis before a committee of the faculty. The composition of the dissertation defense committee is uniformly regulated by policies of the College and the University as administered by the Office of Doctoral Studies.

Recommendations

As a graduate-only institution, the nature of assessment varies widely at Teachers College. The College has not had a “one size fits all” assessment plan except in the broadest sense of the uniform requirements that exist for earning Master’s and doctoral degrees. The NCATE accreditation process has moved the College forward in developing a comprehensive assessment system for teachers and other professional school personnel, but the other programs at the College have yet to be set under the same microscope. We recommend that the College build on the momentum generated by the NCATE assessment plan and engage other programs at the College—perhaps by broad discipline groupings, for example, Psychology or Health—in the development of assessment plans that would ultimately include all of the programs at the College, while simultaneously keeping in mind the unique characteristics of each program.

Both students and faculty have concerns about the current course evaluation form and the process by which results of the course evaluation process are disseminated. We recommend that the course evaluation form be reviewed and revised to accommodate the variety of approaches to teaching and the range of course formats at the College. The course evaluation system should
not only support faculty in their commitment to improve their teaching, but also support students in course planning and selection. We recommend that the results of the evaluations be more readily available to students who can review them when choosing their courses.
CHAPTER IX: INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

STANDARD 13
Related Educational Activities

Introduction

This chapter of our self-study report focuses on Teachers College programs and activities for its degree students that have particular content, location or mode of delivery that differ from regular course offerings:

- Basic skills programs for students who need help in preparing themselves to succeed in academic work at the College;
- Workshops and other offerings by the Center for Outreach and Educational Innovation (CEO&I);
- Degree programs that are offered off-site; and
- Courses offered in an online format.

In addition, the report describes a set of certificate programs offered through the College. Certificate programs registered with the New York State Department of Education lead to award of a formal certificate. Both current degree students and non-degree students may enroll in certificate programs at the College.

The intent of this chapter is to examine and provide evidence as to:

- how these educational activities relate to the offerings in the regular academic programs of our degree students;
- how or whether these related educational offerings enhance the educational experience of our degree students;
- what evidence the College has that these offerings enhance or enrich our degree students’ experience at the College; and
- what decision-making apparatus is in place at the College to ensure that these offerings address students’ needs, but do not undercut the integrity of the formal academic program.

Teachers College serves a large audience of practitioners, researchers, and policymakers in education and the helping professions. Many of its offerings for this audience are intended for those not enrolled in a degree program. While this report concentrates on related educational offerings that are intended to benefit the College’s population of degree students, as many CEO&I offerings provide both credit and non-credit options, those offerings are included here because a large percentage of our degree students enroll in these offerings for credit, as part of their degree programs. As noted, the College also offers a number of certificate programs.
While degree students may enroll in these programs, the award of the certificate is distinct from the requirements for degree programs.

The following sections will briefly describe the nature, scope, rationale, and audiences of each of the four types of related educational activity the College offers its degree students. We consider how each is assessed in terms of its benefits to the students, with available evidence to that effect. Further examined is how each type of activity complements, or otherwise relates to, regular College offerings, to determine how this fits into the life of the students. Finally, we offer some suggestions for planning, coordinating, and improving the impact of these activities on the student experience.

Basic Skills

Teachers College, as a graduate school of education, tries to ensure through its admissions process that students accepted into its programs are well-qualified to do graduate work. Nevertheless, some students need various kinds of help to succeed academically. Accordingly, the College offers such help in three areas: writing, research, and the use of technology.

The College has many international students, and some of them, as well as some native English speakers, find that their writing and communication skills need improvement. The Writing Center offers programs and services to assist these students. While most students come to the College with some background in conducting educational or other research, there are some who need help in basic or more advanced research techniques. The Library offers a variety of workshops. Technology provides an ever-changing set of tools for work and research, and students arrive with varying degrees of expertise in using them. The College’s Computing and Information Services department offers many workshops on all aspects of using the technology students will need in their academic lives.

The programs and services offered in all three of these areas—the Writing Center, the Gottesman Libraries, and Computing and Information Services—are reviewed in the sections that follow. In all three of these basic skills areas, workshop attendance is voluntary. All three areas advertise available workshops each term, and students almost exclusively refer themselves. Program advisors do from time to time recommend some of these offerings to their students, but to the best of our knowledge, no formal processes are in place to identify and refer students who need special help in any of these areas.

The Graduate Writing Center

The Graduate Writing Center provides discipline-specific, individualized, professional development to Teachers College students. The Graduate Writing Center was initially established in the TESOL program in the Department of Arts and Humanitites to assist students who spoke English as a second language with certain types of writing skills, i.e., dissertation preparation, APA format, and literature review preparation. Over time, it was felt that students in other departments could also benefit from the services being offered by the Center.

The emphasis of the Center’s offerings has been on preparing graduate students to be more successful writers, both within their disciplines and in their publishing communities. More specifically, the Center offers both one-on-one private fee-based tutoring and workshops (both group
and individual). The private tutoring provides instruction in writing strategies, but does not engage in editing or proofreading. The writing workshops are devoted to such topics as dissertation writing, grant writing, advanced grammar for graduate students, APA referencing, and so forth.

The Center has a coordinator at 20 hours per week, 1 part-time clerical staff at 20 hours per week, and approximately 15-24 part-time tutors. Tutors do not do clerical or administrative work in the Center, and only work with student-clients.

As the range of programs and services offered by the Center has grown, the ratio between native and non-native speakers of English population who utilize the Writing Center has become more balanced. In FY2004, for example, the native/non-native ratio was approximately 45% to 55%, respectively. The Center predominantly serves Master’s-level students, but a number of doctoral students also utilize the Center.

During the 2004-05 academic year, the Center offered a wide range of workshops that served approximately 90 student-clients during the Fall 2004 term and approximately 60 student clients during the Spring 2005, term. The workshops offered across both terms focused on the following topics:

- Summarizing, Paraphrasing, and Quoting
- Getting Started on Your Paper
- Using APA
- Introductions and Conclusions
- Research Paper
- Plagiarism
- Literature Review
- Writing Arguments
- Research Design
- Organizing Your Paper
- Summarizing
- Punctuation for Graduate Students
- Conference Papers
- Research Proposals
- Grammar for Graduate Students
- Personal Statements
- Format and Principles for Writing Scientific Research Papers
- That Thing Called Flow

In addition to workshop offerings, during the 2004-05 academic year, the Center also provided tutoring services. During Fall, 2004, some 1,250 hours of tutoring were provided to 120 student-clients. During Spring, 2005, nearly 1,720 hours of tutoring services were provided to 85 student-clients.

Decisions to expand services to all Teachers College students also led to a review of the organizational and administrative arrangements for the Center. After review, it was decided to bring the Center under the umbrella of the Office of Enrollment and Student Services, and subsequently to house it in the Office of Student Activities and Programs. A budget was finalized, and a new part-time director was hired in the Fall of 2005. It is anticipated that the reorganization of the Center will lead to a wider array of programs and services, and an increased student-client base.
The Gottesman Libraries

As Teachers College was preparing to make a major investment in rebuilding its library, in 1999-2000, the Teachers College Seminar on the Future of the Library prepared a report which described three roles for libraries in the future: the library as a center of technology to support scholarship; the library as an intellectual social center for the College; and the library as a source for content and services for audiences beyond the campus.

All three roles relate to the kinds of basic skills students need and how the College prepares and supports students in acquiring them. Today’s students need not only to know traditional library skills, but also to know how to use a range of electronic information tools for research and scholarship. Accordingly, the new Gottesman Libraries endeavors to educate the College’s students through workshops, by creating a physical space with access to electronic and physical tools and resources; by making librarians available to aid students onsite; by assigning librarians to work closely with academic departments; and by creating new electronic tools for distant audiences. (The latter is discussed under the section entitled “Distance Learning” below.)

A major form of assistance to students needing basic research skills is the series of workshops offered by the Gottesman Libraries each term on such topics as library research; refining Web searching skills; elements of dissertation research; primary sources for research and curriculum; and using EndNote for research and writing. Most of these are offered every month of each term. From September, 2004, through March, 2005, almost 400 students attended these workshops. The library also offers individual consulting to students, and in the same period, 128 students took advantage of this service. The library has not distributed evaluation forms to its workshop attendees. Informally, the high attendance numbers at workshops would seem to indicate that attendees needed these offerings or found them useful. However, no formal method of evaluating their effectiveness has been put into place.

In addition to its workshops, the library supports student learning about research and electronic information tools in diverse ways. Throughout its three completed floors, the library has placed over 100 networked computers which are heavily used by students. On the third floor, it has created a comfortable space (combining tables and easy chairs) where students can use their own computers in a wireless environment. On all three floors, it has constructed small group meeting rooms of various sizes. The librarians regularly consult and advise students on an as-needed basis. Also, each of the College’s nine academic departments has been assigned one of its librarians as liaison and educator. These librarians consult instructors about physical and electronic resources they need in teaching, and construct electronic resource collections in each area on the library’s website. The librarians also regularly consult with all instructors on visiting their classes and talking to students about electronic research. In these ways, the Gottesman Libraries has attempted to create a rich and supportive physical environment that provides necessary and adequate resources to educate students about research and new electronic information tools.

Computer and Information Services (CIS)

The third basic skills area in which Teachers College offers assistance to its students focuses on the computer skills they will need for graduate study. Academic Computing Services
(ACS), a division of our Computing and Information Services (CIS), offers a wide variety of workshops to students each term. In the Spring 2005 term, 77 workshops were scheduled. Workshops span a range of topics: instruction in the use of software for graduate work (e.g., Flash, Microsoft Office tools, Lectora, EndNote, etc.); creating and maintaining websites; creating and editing digital audio and video files; creating and managing electronic portfolios; wireless Internet setup; virus protection; fundamentals of operating systems; issues in computer privacy; and more. Attendance averaged 6-7 students per workshop.

ACS plans workshops on the basis of assessments of what students need. Workshops may also be provided in response to student feedback or requests, or from faculty requests. ACS has created an online evaluation questionnaire for workshop attendees, which it has administered for the past few years. The questionnaire has asked:

- primary reason for attending the workshop;
- overall course rating;
- ratings for course content, materials, clarity and organization of presentation, pace of the course;
- overall difficulty rating for the course;
- whether the workshop met participants’ expectations, and whether participants found it useful; and
- what kinds of workshops participants would like to see offered in the future.¹

All workshop attendance is voluntary on the part of students. ACS advertises its offerings through flyers and brochures, and on the Teachers College website, and students choose those they think they need. Faculty program advisors may also suggest and recommend workshops to their students.

As with the library, it should be noted that CIS and ACS have done more to support Teachers College students than offer workshops. More comprehensive discussions were provided in Chapter III, in the section on “Administration.” Briefly, however, our computing services support technology in a growing number of multimedia classrooms, provide and maintain e-mail accounts, and run three computer labs with a wide range of software. They have created a software platform (Classweb) for supporting all Teachers College courses. They maintain a lab for supporting digital video and audio work. An annual Demonstration Day, sponsored by CIS, provides faculty and students with an opportunity to demonstrate software and applications they use in instruction and research. Individualized, tailored workshops are also available to encourage faculty to integrate technology into instruction and research activities. The Dean’s Technology Grant program gas provided several faculty members each year with resources, assistance, and incentives for course innovations utilizing technology. The Educational Technology Specialist also supports faculty in their efforts to incorporate technology and new media into their programs of instruction. CIS supports hundreds of desktop computers

¹Unfortunately, the results of these evaluations are not available. Apparently, they were lost when the network server storing them crashed before the results had been tabulated.
throughout the College, as well as LAN and wireless networks; as of Fall, 2005, it had created an entirely wireless College environment.

In addition, the College has supported faculty in their use of technology in a number of ways. A grant from the U.S. Department of Education from 2000 to 2004 (Preparing Tomorrow’s Teachers to Use Technology) assisted pre-service faculty in integrating technology into their programs. In 2000, a new educational technology specialist position was created in the Dean’s Office to support professional development of faculty in the use of technology. ACS also conducts faculty workshops and does in-class training in software upon the request of faculty.²

Recommendations

It seems clear that all three of the units of the College described in this section (the Writing Center, the Gottesman Libraries, and Computing and Information Services) are offering workshops that students desire, and through which students have learned much about research, technology, and writing. The offerings have been rich in their quantity and range of information and skills. Questions arise, however, about how well we are planning for students’ needs and how much we know about the effect of these workshops on students’ academic experiences, and we offer the following recommendations:

• **Planning.** Workshops in all three units are generally planned on the basis of what instructors or center directors know about what students need. These leaders undoubtedly possess a great deal of knowledge about student needs—from their own experience as well as from student or faculty feedback. But in all cases, there has been little proactive assessment of needs of students in terms of workshop offerings. There is, or should be, a feedback loop between this type of planning and assessment of the effects of workshops, so that the workshops that are offered will reflect what students are lacking.

• **Referral.** Related to this first point, it appears that referral of students to specific workshops is not consistent. We know of cases in which individual academic advisors have recommended that their students take a writing workshop. By and large, however, enrollment in all of these workshops is left to student initiative. All three units advertise their offerings and students respond if they think any meet their needs. We suggest that the three units work more closely with programs and their academic advisors, so that academic programs devise plans and criteria for referring students to the workshops they need, and for deciding which workshops should be mandatory for students deemed to need them.

• **Coordination.** In general, we suggest a greater degree of coordination between units that offer workshops for degree students and for the academic departments of these students. In the past, communication has existed between individual faculty and these units, but programs as a whole need to think more carefully—at a program or department level—about how these workshops can fit into their academic programs and plan accordingly. This kind of planning might include thinking about which

---

² This is a partial description of the kinds of support in technology offered by CIS, ACS, and the College as a whole. More comprehensive information is available to the site visit team in the Resource Room.
workshops are needed to complement the program, which might be required, who
will teach them, and when they will be offered.

- **Assessment.** Two of the three units have not conducted any formal assessment of
their workshops. Academic Computing has offered online evaluation questionnaires
for students, but these have been electronically lost, and in the past were not
systematically analyzed. We suggest that all three units consider the best methods of
assessing what students have learned from workshops, and that they analyze these
results and share them with academic programs.

**Center for Educational and Outreach and Innovation (CEO&I):**
**The Lifelong Learning Program**

At Teachers College, Lifelong Learning and Continuing Education programs are delivered
through the Center for Educational Outreach & Innovation (CEO&I). Program offerings include:
novative workshops, symposia, courses (long and short format), national and international
conferences, institutes, and seminars—many developed in cooperation with academic departments.

**Rationale**

Academic programming from CEO&I is designed to complement and enhance the degree
and non-degree student experience and provide the professional (non-degree seeker) with a
convenient, world-class education option. Professionals may acquire new skills and knowledge
in order to maintain or advance professional credentials. In addition, such offerings afford
faculty the opportunity to experiment with new themes and delivery modes. There are numerous
reasons for and benefits to presenting the types of offerings that CEO&I produces:

- They create opportunities for participants to advance in their careers by enrolling in
courses/programs that may meet city, state, and federal employment requirements.

- They foster important scholarly conversations and promote learning in the fields in
which Teachers College is expert. Conferences and symposia draw experts and
participants from around the world—a benefit for both the expert and participants
from the College community.

- Offerings that bring in outside (non-degree) participants bring in outside expertise
that is valuable to the College. When events include both our own degree students
and outside participants, our students benefit from the knowledge and perspectives of
professionals in the field.

- They help recruit future degree students. It is often the case that teachers or other
professionals come to the College for a conference or workshop and later decide to
enroll in a degree program.

Formats such as workshops or study tours often complement formal degree programs by
covering areas that programs cannot easily accommodate. In this way, they help round out
degree programs with special topics or travel.
Participation

Approximately 300 Lifelong Learning and Continuing Education offerings are delivered each year. During the 2003-04 fiscal year (Fall, 2003; Spring, 2004; and Summer, 2004), approximately 2,700 non-credit students were enrolled in CEO&I’s offerings. Reflecting the multiple audiences for CEO&I offerings, about 600 participants who were not currently enrolled in degree programs at the College enrolled in CEO&I offerings for credit. Altogether, a total of approximately 3,300 non-degree students enrolled during the 2003-04 fiscal year.

During this same fiscal year, 3,300 degree students registered for about 7,100 credits. This means that, on average, each degree student took slightly more than two credits in workshops or other CEO&I offerings during the year. And, from a total of about 5,300 degree students in the College as a whole, more than half registered for at least one of these offerings during the year. Thus, workshops and other offerings outside of the regular degree program requirements do play an important role in the experience of our degree students.

Planning and Coordination

Typically, CEO&I provides financial (budget) resources, technical assistance, marketing, and event facilitation. Faculty and departments provide academic oversight and participate in the academic design and construction of the offerings. CEO&I, along with the academic department, monitor and evaluate each offering and the students’ experiences in the program.

Discussions with faculty who plan CEO&I offerings reveal that (in some cases) offerings are planned with the needs of the academic program in mind. In other cases, individual faculty may plan special offerings without a full consideration of how they fit into their academic programs. In all cases, credit offerings are approved by academic programs and departments, but this does not ensure that all offerings delivered by a given program are coordinated and planned to fit students’ needs. We suggest that each program appoint a liaison or a committee to plan and coordinate offerings with the total academic program, in terms of what is needed to complement the program, how many are offered and how many students are allowed to fit into their programs, who teaches workshops, and how often they are offered.

New Mission, Goals

With the appointment in 2005 of a new Executive Director, Ann Armstrong, CEO&I has redefined its mission and goals, which will be shared with the TC Community in March, 2006. Looking to the future, CEO&I will function as a service unit for the College by partnering with academic departments, faculty members, and graduate students to expand the reach and impact of the College. CEO&I will work with key stakeholders to develop innovative programs and services for existing and new audiences. CEO&I will pursue the following goals:

1. Foster the creation and expansion of new innovative programs and program formats to reach new audiences across the lifespan
2. Develop existing and additional summer offerings into a comprehensive summer program
3. Develop new revenue streams for the College
Assessment and Feedback

CEO&I has in place a process to review student evaluations and consult with instructors about students’ comments and concerns. The questions asked of workshop participants, however, are relatively global and do not necessarily offer enough insight into the effects of the workshops. Each workshop uses the same short evaluation form with numerical ratings for course content, organization, and instructor professionalism, and yes/no questions about whether the learning experience was positive and the workshop met expectations (space is also provided for student comments). These questions give a good general indication of satisfaction, but do not speak to the particular nature of each workshop, or to how each workshop benefits students in their academic programs and work. We suggest that CEO&I work with academic programs in devising more particular questionnaires or other assessment instruments for individual workshops, which can be reviewed by faculty and programs on a regular basis to assess the effectiveness of individual workshops and of the workshop program as a whole.

Overall, assessment information to date suggests that participants are satisfied with the offerings and feel that their educational objectives were well met.

Summative Evaluation

Summative evaluation surveys and assessments are administered to participants. They are reviewed and, where indicated, program modifications are implemented based on the analysis of quantitative and qualitative feedback. A representative sample of the type and scope of programs and the various feedback loops serve to demonstrate program designs, and the way in which programs fit, extend, and enhance the student and professional experiences at Teachers College. They also serve to demonstrate how offerings are monitored by CEO&I and continuously modified as a result of information gained through feedback.

For each offering, participants are asked to rate content, organization, and instructor professionalism. They are requested to comment critically in writing on the overall learning experience, and whether these offerings are meeting their expectations. A review of evaluations from fiscal years 2004 and 2005 provides some evidence that these offerings are positively received and are meeting students’ academic expectations. For these years, evaluations from 43 offerings were analyzed. Participants were asked to rate course content, course organization, and instructor professionalism on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 representing “Poor,” 3 “Fair,” and 5 “Excellent.” For these 43 workshop offerings, the average student ratings were:

- Course content 4.48
- Course organization 4.43
- Instructor professionalism 4.74

Participants were also asked to respond “Yes” or “No” to the questions of whether the offering was a positive learning experience and whether it met their expectations. To these questions, 96% of all participants attending these workshops believed they were positive learning experiences and 91% said that they met their expectations.
Responses to open-ended questions are also important sources of assessment information. Although less frequent, evidence for corrective actions is sometimes indicated on student comments on the surveys. Based on this evidence, and where feasible, corrective modifications to content and pedagogy are implemented.

Action items as a result of assessment include: shortening slideshows; providing more definitive information and discussions about appropriate actions for guidance counselors; and incorporating cultural factors into the curriculum. Although time is identified as short, request for more time to deliver course content is under consideration. Any modifications in schedule for credit-bearing courses will need to comply with New York State Department of Education regulations governing contact hours and the award of credit.

Branch Campus and Additional Locations

Teachers College currently has one M.A. program offered at a branch campus (Teachers College, Columbia University, Japan), which offers a Master of Arts Program in TESOL that is supported by its own faculty, administrative organization, and budgetary authority. Teachers College also has two off-site programs (the Master of Arts in Music Education, Taiwan; and a doctoral program in education for the gifted that has a cohort at C.W. Post University on Long Island, New York) that qualify as additional locations, which offer at least 50% of an education program.

Branch Campus: M.A. Program in TESOL (Tokyo).

Teachers College, Columbia University inaugurated a Master of Arts Program in TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) in August 1987, in cooperation with the SIMUL Academy in Japan. Its purpose was to respond to the emerging need for teachers of English in schools, colleges and industry. In June, 1991, Dr. Albert Yee, representing the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, visited the Tokyo campus and subsequently recommended that MSA/CHE accreditation be given to the Teachers College/SIMUL Program in Japan. The Tokyo TESOL program was officially included in the Statement of Accreditation Status in the 1997 MSA/CHE self study evaluation (July 10, 1997). On April 17, 2001, under a resolution from Teachers College Trustees, the Tokyo TESOL program became a financially independent branch campus. The program, held at the campus in Suidobashi, Tokyo, provides opportunities for Japanese-speaking teachers of English and English-speaking teachers of English to earn an M.A. degree while teaching full-time.

TESOL program faculty members are all in the Department of Arts and Humanities. The full-time member employed by the College is Associate Professor (Adjunct) Terry Royce, who is also the Program Director and teaches a range of the courses, specifically Discourse Analysis and various TESOL courses such as methods/practica and grammar. Faculty who teach in the program in Tokyo include: Teachers College Faculty from New York who teach out-of-program

---

3Inexplicably, the accredited status of the Tokyo TESOL program was omitted from the 2001 MSA/CHE Periodic Review Report (November 10, 2001). The only off-site instructional location acknowledged was the Long Island University of C.W. Post Campus, Greenvale, New York.
courses during the Summer; internationally-recognized faculty invited from other countries; and faculty who are actively teaching and researching in the TESOL field in Japan.

The M.A. in TESOL is a very practical program that suits teachers of English in the Japanese school system (elementary, junior high, and high schools), as well as those who are working in the commercial sector or are in Japan on such programs as the Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) program. It is especially suited to those Japanese teachers of English who want to apply for 12 months leave to study abroad. The TESOL in Japan program also provides the opportunity for individuals to start the M.A. in the TESOL program in Tokyo and then transfer to New York and complete the degree on site at the College. Non-degree applications are also assessed and accepted at various times.

The M.A. program consists of courses, workshops, and practica offered on Saturdays (4 p.m. to 8 p.m.) and Sundays (10 a.m. to 5 p.m.) throughout the year. On occasion, specialized workshops are offered on Friday evenings. Applicants can apply to start the program in February or July each year. For the M.A. in TESOL, 36 graduate credits are completed over a minimum of 25 months, including three Summer terms. Usually a 1-credit course is 24 hours, a 3-credit practicum 42 hours, and a regular 3-credit course 36 hours long. The reason for this time allocation is that the 1- and 2-credit courses are workshops, while the 3-point courses tend towards the more traditional model of lectures and discussions. To ensure that graduates have a minimal knowledge base of theories and practices in the field, candidates are required to write two M.A. Exam Papers (A & B) and six critical Reaction Papers. Students must also complete a M.A. project, which is an extended piece of research on language learning or teaching.

The Tokyo TESOL program is managed and supervised in consultation with TESOL Faculty within the Department of Arts and Humanities at Teachers College, New York. The policies and procedures followed adhere to the same kinds of standards of program design, approval, implementation, and student evaluation as all other degree programs in Teachers College. Consequently, all courses are reviewed through the Department of Arts and Humanities and the Academic Programs Subcommittee of the Faculty Executive Committee. Both these review mechanisms ensure TESOL (Japan) courses conform to College Standards, which are in accordance with NCATE Standards. In addition, the regular liaison with Teachers College Faculty and administration, and the visiting faculty program whereby courses are taught in Tokyo by Teachers College Faculty, ensures that the overall level of academic excellence and the breadth and depth of student experiences are continually monitored.

In the TESOL program in Japan, course times are approximately one-third longer than courses at the College, in most cases because of the desire of the students, who are mostly Japanese, to also improve their English language abilities through the graduate coursework. In 1987, this was decided to be part of the program design, based on the results of surveys of Japanese graduates from Teachers College (New York) who stated that one of the reasons they went to New York was to improve their English as well as earn an M.A. It is also the reason for

---

4The Japan Exchange and Teaching (JET) program sponsors young college and university graduates from overseas to participate in international exchange and foreign language education throughout Japan. Established in 1987, the JET program is conducted by local authorities and other contracting organizations in Japan in cooperation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology; the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications; and the Council of Local Authorities for International Relations.
greater flexibility with applicants and their initial TOEFL score, whereby the minimum
acceptable TOEFL can be adjusted, contingent on successfully completing the courses and
meeting the TOEFL criteria within the first 24 credit points.

For the M.A. in TESOL, 36 graduate points are required within a 5-year time limit to
complete the degree. A minimum of a B course average or better is required for the awarding of
the M.A. degree. No transfer credits from other institutions are accepted. As well as
successfully completing all program requirements, an exit interview with one member of the
TESOL program faculty or staff, or the completion of an exit interview form, is also required of
all candidates after graduation. The interview provides program staff with feedback from
students about their personal and professional growth while at Teachers College, which in turn
stimulates continual needs assessment and evaluation of the TESOL program.

All assessments in the courses and workshops are carried out by the particular faculty
member involved. The nature of the instruments varies from course to course, but the most common
would be a series of written assignments requiring application of ideas to the students’ teaching
context, essays based on readings and research, seminar presentations, short knowledge tests, and in-
class performance assessments by the professor. Attendance is also a requirement. In the methods
and practica courses, seminar presentations on teaching theory, micro-teaching presentations, and in-
class performance assessments by the professor are required. Each student in a practicum is required
to be observed in his/her school by the instructor at least once, and twice by their peers. They are
also required to visit their peers’ schools to carry out an observation, which is followed by a post-
observation discussion meeting. In the last session of each course, the branch campus students
follow Teachers College policy and complete course and instructor evaluations, all of which are
housed on campus and used by the Director to review the instructor. Photocopies of these
evaluations are sent to the instructor after the grades have been publicly posted.

Additional Locations: M.A. in Music Education (Taiwan),
and Ed.D. in Gifted Education (C.W. Post).

The Master of Arts in Music Education was begun in 1996 through the initiative of a
former Teachers College music graduate student. The Summer teaching program is held at the
Chinese Cultural University (co-sponsors) in Taiwan. It is staffed on a rotation basis by faculty
from the Teachers College music program, who undertake a four-week residency each Summer
term. Students can take up to 8 credits per Summer term, and in total six courses (maximum 16
credit points), after which the M.A. program is completed with a residency at Teachers College.
In general, faculty teach core courses as well as those within their specialty.

The student cohort in Taiwan is mostly a homogenous group who has specific needs in
the areas of music education that are partly shaped by language and educational structures. All
registered students must conform to the criteria expected for any Teachers College applicant into
the Master’s degree (meet TOEFL expectation, transcript review, etc). On attendance at
Teachers College, students complete other program requirements and institutional expectations
(such as out-of-program requirements).

Students enrolled in this 32-credit M.A. program cover content that draws from four
areas: Pedagogy (minimum two courses), Research (minimum one course), Comprehensive
Musicianship (minimum one core course), and Music Performance (minimum one core course). In order to graduate, students complete the necessary course work, present a portfolio, and demonstrate competent musicianship in performance as approved by faculty.

The M.A. in Music Education offered in Taiwan allows students to earn a maximum of 16 credit points towards their degree, after which they are required to continue their program at Teachers College. As the courses taught in Taiwan each summer are those designed and delivered by Teachers College Faculty, a consistent standard is maintained since they are subject to all planning and administrative protocols that apply at the College.

In the Taiwan music program, students are assessed on the basis of course completion and program completion. Performance in courses is determined by successfully meeting the particular requirements that are established for individual courses, as monitored by individual faculty. The rates of incompletes and/or failures are very low as the students are committed to their studies. While course completion patterns are positive, there are concerns that surface with respect to program completion. The review of program completion data shows that there is no difference in graduation rates between those students who begin the Master’s in Taiwan and then complete the 16-point residency requirement at Teachers College, and those students who enroll in the traditional music education program. This pattern suggests that the overall lower graduation rate for the Taiwan program is possibly a function of the challenges some participants face in arranging both time and resources to meet the 16-point residency requirement. While there may be a range of possible responses—from changes to the residency requirement, to the inclusion of distance learning course options—those are matters referred to the program faculty for review.

The Gifted Education program in the department of Curriculum and Teaching has maintained a cohort of doctoral students in Gifted Education at C.W. Post University on Long Island since 1983. The Gifted Education program, directed by Professor James Borland at Teachers College, rents space at C.W. Post and conducts the coursework for the cohort there, thus comprising the program’s affiliation with C.W. Post. Professor Leonard Blackman started this cohort program in 1983, mostly to accommodate students who lived on Long Island and for whom it was more convenient to meet at C.W. Post than to come to Teachers College.

The program has also found that it is beneficial to students to have a distinct cohort in which to work, to create a sense of community. The program reports that it has not been advertising for this cohort for some time, and consequently only about 12 active students are currently enrolled, all of whom are at the stage of writing their dissertations.

Academically, the program for this cohort is identical to the Gifted doctoral program that meets at Teachers College. Students undergo the same admissions process, with the same standards and courses. Students enrolled for this degree meet the departmental doctoral core requirements, complete coursework in gifted education, and undertake dissertation research on a problem related to gifted students. For students completing the doctoral gifted concentration, including the Long Island students, 27 points of coursework in gifted education are required, including 9-12 points in the C&T 6502 Advanced Seminar on Giftedness. Because C.W. Post is not far from Teachers College, this cohort program uses mostly the same set of instructors who
teach at the Teachers College campus. Faculty from both the Department of Curriculum and Teaching as well as other departments teach at the C.W. Post campus.

The doctoral cohort program in Gifted Education that meets at C.W. Post University differs from the program meeting at Teachers College only in its setting. The program was created for the convenience of students from the Long Island area, but it is close enough to Teachers College to use the same faculty who teach the same courses available at the Manhattan campus. The department of Curriculum and Teaching sets standards for these courses, appoints instructors, and monitors course offerings.

The three programs described in this section are all long-running degree cohorts that have served many students. To ensure that the quality of student experience in the programs continues to be realized, we offer the following recommendations:

- The improved services now available through the Gottesman Libraries that can be accessed through ClassWeb, e-Reserve, and other databases, offer Teachers College students studying at a branch campus similar opportunities as those enjoyed by students studying at Teachers College in New York. The potential for this off-site access is only beginning to be fully realized, and Teachers College administrators in Japan and New York need to ensure that efficient operations and services are established and maintained so that the quality of students’ learning is maximized.

- Logistically, the M.A. in Music Education offered in the Taiwan location faces a challenge due to the drop-off in the graduation rate among the students who are unable to attend Teachers College in New York to complete their degree. It is recommended that the Music Program, Department of Arts and Humanities, review options for increasing the proportion of courses that can be completed offsite (for instance, the possibility of delivering more theory courses online or inviting Teachers College faculty to teach out-of-program courses during Summer), and to conduct a feasibility study of the cost/benefits of moving towards a branch campus model.

**Distance Learning**

Teachers College’s Distance Learning Project (DLP) was begun seven years ago to create courses online. The majority of courses that have been offered online have primarily been existing courses that were developed/modified for an online format. One rationale for establishing DLP and offering online courses was to attract a new audience of students to the College, especially those who live too far away to take courses in person. For this purpose, three online certificate programs (described below) were created for non-degree students. Another rationale in creating DLP was to provide an alternative for degree students, allowing them more flexibility in course scheduling. Students often balance their course hours and traveling by taking one or two courses online. In almost every case, the courses they take online are also offered in person, although usually not in the same term as they are offered online.

During the year beginning with the Summer 2004 term and ending with the Spring 2005 term, the College offered a total of 43 online courses. Five of the nine academic departments were involved in these offerings: the Mathematics, Science, and Technology department offered 14; Organization and Leadership offered 7; Human Development offered 10; Health and Behavioral
Studies offered 6; and, Arts and Humanities offered 6. It should be mentioned that two of the online certificate program courses are in Mathematics, Science, and Technology and Human Development, accounting for the larger numbers of courses from these departments.

In terms of students, during this same period, the 43 courses enrolled a total of 906 students, of whom 829 were Teachers College degree students and the other 77 were non-degree students. (These figures represent total students in courses; since some students may have taken more than one online course, the actual numbers of distinct students are undoubtedly somewhat lower.) Degree students registered in these courses for credit. Some of the online courses, including those in certificate programs, were offered for credit or non-credit, and non-degree students may have registered in either option. As mentioned below, under Certificate Programs, some certificate students did take the online courses for credit and later enrolled in the corresponding Teachers College degree program.

It is clear that for the recent past, at least, the main audience for online courses has been Teachers College degree students, who represent over 90% of the enrollment. Partly for this reason, the focus of our online program has shifted over the last two years—from trying to attract new non-degree students to supporting existing courses and degree programs. This shift was an organizational response to the departure of key staff in DLP and the pending transitions in leadership and mission for the Center for Educational Outreach and Innovation which had housed DLP since its inception. More specifically, during the Spring 2005 term, the development and support functions of DLP were reorganized and assimilated into the services of the Gottesman Libraries. At the same time, responsibility for approving course offerings in online formats and scheduling the courses has been transferred to academic program offices, including the Office of the Associate Dean for Academic Administration. Previously, a separate DLP program budget funded the salaries of online instructors. With an emphasis on supporting online courses that are integral to current degree programs, instructional expenses for online offerings will be transitioned to regular program and academic department budgets. Also, while online courses taught by regular faculty were, in the past, frequently taught as overages in addition to their regular teaching loads, the current focus anticipates that faculty will offer online courses as part of their regular teaching load.

All of these changes have been part of an effort to integrate online courses more fully into academic departments and degree programs. Again, pending transitions in leadership in CEO&I and a redefinition of the mission and goals of that unit, the College has made the decision to focus its Distance Learning resources on supporting academic programs. The Gottesman Library, which now has responsibility for supporting the development of online courses, is in a position to offer support in several ways. First, each academic department is assigned a librarian who coordinates library services with departments, including identifying appropriate electronic resources. Second, the library is in the process of developing new tools to support online work, including a software platform within which courses and other kinds of online activities can be conducted. Third, the library is supporting a unit which works with faculty and staff on how to use and manage online courses.

From the time the College first began offering online courses seven years ago, it has treated them in the same way that it treats face-to-face courses in terms of standards for instruction, student work, and evaluation. Academic departments propose and oversee online
courses, and in almost every case, online courses are adaptations of already existing courses taught in the classroom. DLP created a formula to calculate the amount of time students spend in Teachers College’s online courses, and analysis has shown that students typically spend more time in the work of online courses than in face-to-face courses.

The College’s policy on offering online courses has always been a voluntary one; faculty have been offered the opportunity to adapt any of their course for online offering, and DLP has assisted those who wish to do so. Over the last seven years, the number of courses offered online has risen from 3 per term to over 20 per term. Compared to the number of the College’s face-to-face courses, 20 is not a large number, and some programs and departments in the College do not offer any online courses.

Clearly, many of our degree students are attracted to the online course format. This is clear both from the number of degree students who choose to take courses online each term, and also from students’ comments. For several years, DLP has conducted online course evaluations in its courses, and the online unit of the library continues to administer them. In July, 2005, a team of three people analyzed the open-ended comments of students from three terms of online courses—Fall, Spring, and Summer. While students were never asked to compare their opinions of online versus face-to-face courses in the evaluations, several questions in the questionnaire—on the online courses’ organization, instruction, resources, discussions—often served to elicit students’ opinions about the online format in general.

Analysis of students’ comments, then, revealed many things that students liked about their online courses, including:

- the design of many of the courses in how the online site allowed instructors to post resources and organize discussions in forums;
- instructors’ involvement and insightful comments in discussions;
- good online forum discussions, in which students learned from peers;
- prompt feedback from course instructors; and
- the ability to access the course from home and at any time of day.

On the negative side, some students mentioned aspects of the online courses which they did not like, including:

- poor facilitation of discussions;
- poor course design or organization on the part of instructors;
- minimal involvement of instructors and lack of feedback;
- technical difficulties, such as the course site not working or inability to access the site for some reason; and,
- not seeing and talking with others face-to-face.
It can be seen that some of these negative and positive assessments mirror one another. Well-designed and well-organized online courses can be very attractive and supporting, but some instructors (according to students) did not design or organize well, thereby detracting from the online course experience. Similarly, instructor involvement in the course and communication with students are seen as very important, and courses usually succeeded in part because of the degree to which instructors were involved in them.

It is also clear that, for some students at least, one of the attractive features of online courses is their accessibility from any network connection, at any time one wants. Also, many students seem to appreciate the nature and quality of well-facilitated online discussions. The research on online learning and the experience of many faculty who have taught online courses finds that asynchronous online discussion often draws richer, more reflective comments from participants than in-person discussion does. Many students’ comments here draw attention to this feature. One student, for instance, commented, “I have never been in a classroom that had more dialogue than this online course. I loved learning from my peers.”

On the other hand, it is also clear that some students miss being in a live course and do not see asynchronous discussion forums as an adequate alternative to face-to-face discussion. Students clearly vary in the degree to which they desire live or written discussions. The option of meeting with the instructor, as exercised for the student cited here, is not available to those taking an online course from a distance. Whether video discussions, which will most likely be incorporated in Teachers College’s online courses soon, will satisfy those who prefer live discussions remains to be seen. Developing “blended instruction” models may also be an alternative.

At present, then, online courses do not make a very large impact on our degree students’ educational experiences, simply because not many have been offered. Because of the shift to integrating online course administration into academic departments, however, it seems likely that, in the near future, at least some of our faculty will begin offering some courses online as part of their regular course loads. This development should encourage greater program and departmental discussion about which courses should be offered online, as well as when and how they might fit into students’ programs and faculty schedules.

The College has several good reasons to continue studying the impact of online courses and to continue thinking about and developing ways to better implement them. First, online learning has positive attributes such as the (potentially) rich nature of asynchronous discussion, which might well enhance the quality of any course. Second, it seems clear that many students are attracted to online courses, either because of their convenience or the nature of their learning experiences or both. Third, intensive M.A. programs, in which students come to Teachers College only in the Summer, partly rely on online offerings for these students during the Fall and Spring terms; in the future, it is possible that programs at branch campuses may only use online courses in their curricula.

Success with online programs, though, will depend on several kinds of activity, and we offer the following recommendations:

- Academic departments, programs, and faculty should continue to learn about online learning—its potentials and possible pitfalls—and should actively think about and
plan for integration of online offerings, where appropriate, into program offerings and faculty schedules.

- The library should continue to investigate and develop, in consultation with faculty and programs, tools to support online learning and teaching, including new platforms for learning, new ways to use electronic resources, and the integration of video and other media into online activities.

- The library, along with academic programs, should develop a set of guidelines for online teaching, and should work to educate programs and faculty about online teaching. It seems clear that, in the past, the same high quality of online instruction has not been evident in every online course. Standards for course design and organization, facilitation of online discussion, and involvement of instructors in their courses should become routinely accepted aspects of online activity at the College.

Certificate Programs

The College supports six active certificate programs (described below), which differ from one another in various ways. Three of the College’s certificate programs are offered online: Teaching and Learning with Technology; Designing Interactive Multimedia Instruction; and Cognition and Technology. The first two have been officially approved by New York State. All require students to take 15 credits in 5 online courses. In all three cases, the courses required are part of their programs’ regular course offerings, and are also taught as face-to-face courses at the College. The College programs in which these certificates are located (Computing in Education, Instructional Technology and Media, and Human Cognition and Learning, respectively) design and approve the certificate programs, and provide the instructors for them. All three programs were designed to attract new students to the College, and all permit participants to take their courses for credit or non-credit. In the last three years, a total of about 25 students have participated in these three programs, several of whom have gone on to enroll in the Master’s degree for that program.

Besides these online programs, three active certificate programs meet at the College, sponsored by the programs in Peace Education, Conflict Resolution, and TESOL (Teaching of English as a Second Language). None are state-approved and all offer certificates of attendance.

The certificate in Peace Education is awarded to non-credit participants upon completion of five trainings, including one special workshop offered by international visiting scholars. The trainings provide a substantive base and training in the pedagogy and methodologies of peace education, with emphasis on practical application. All involve substantive and curricular participation by staff from the College’s Peace Education Center. Most of the offerings in this certificate program are also available for credit, and degree students are permitted to take them.

The certificate of attendance in Conflict Resolution may be taken for credit or non-credit, and requires the completion of 16 credits of courses, including a 3-credit internship in conflict resolution or mediation. In the past five years, over 2,000 students have enrolled in the courses included in the certificate program, but only 121 of them have completed all the requirements...
and earned the certificate of attendance. The disparity in these numbers occurs because the courses are open to and are part of regular academic offerings for degree students, and the certificate program participants constitute one small group who also take them.

The TESOL certificate of attendance involves an intensive 7-week Summer program offering professional development courses in the Teaching of English as a Second or Foreign Language. This is a non-credit and non-degree program co-sponsored by the College’s Center for Educational Outreach and Innovation and the TESOL Program in the Department of Arts and Humanities. The program was designed for students who either do not need a Master’s degree or who are unsure if they want to go on to the Master’s degree. The cohort each Summer usually contains around 40 students, about one-third of whom come from overseas.

In terms of numbers, these certificate programs do not involve many participants—no more than 100 to 150 per year—and all of whom, except for a small number in the Conflict Resolution certificate program, are not regular Teachers College degree students.

The general rationale for certificate programs is to provide an opportunity for students not in degree programs to obtain some certification of accomplishment from Teachers College in their field. In certain certificate programs, regular degree students can take some of the courses, but the certificates are designed for non-degree students. The work done in our certificate programs is generally equivalent to about half the coursework in an M.A. degree. For any of the programs, it is possible, upon completion, for students to enter regular degree programs, although in these non-credit programs, they would need to take all of the required credits through the Master’s program.

Each of the certificate programs is associated with a degree program at the College, and each was designed and approved by that program. In each case, the faculty of its program (and the department in which it resides) judged the certificate program to fulfill a needed function or to supply a necessary addition to other program offerings. In the case of all of the programs, however, the addition is intended to serve a cohort other than regular degree students. Four of the programs consist of regular College courses, which may also be taken by degree students; however, as certificate programs, the certificate option does not apply to degree students.

In terms of evaluating the progress of their students, all of the certificate programs seem to meet the same kinds of standards held by degree programs. Five of the six certificate programs (the three online ones, the Peace Education program, and the Conflict Resolution program) consist of regular Teachers College credit offerings that have been approved and are being monitored by their academic programs. Degree students take these offerings for credit while certificate students take them for non-credit; in the case of the online certificate programs, degree students may also take them for credit. Evaluation of students in these certificate programs thus meets the standards created for students in regular course offerings.

The TESOL certificate program maintains a rigorous schedule of student evaluation. Students are evaluated on the basis of in-class performance, homework assignments, papers, lesson plans, final projects, exams, and progress made in their student teaching. The program director observes instructors at least once in the seven-week session. In addition, students fill out program evaluations after each workshop and at the end of the seven weeks. Based on these
evaluations, the program director submits a report each Fall to the TESOL Program coordinator and to the Director of CEO&I.

All of the certificate programs provide valuable experience for participants. They are operated and overseen by academic programs, and they maintain the same standards of pedagogy and student performance as those programs. They complement the regular degree offerings, but they do so with a separate group of students. It is true, as mentioned above, that in some cases, those who complete certificates may later enroll in degree programs, but this happens infrequently.

Recommendations

This chapter has described five kinds of educational activities that differ in specific ways. Workshops offered by CEO&I and basic skills workshops offered by the Gottesman Libraries, and the Writing Center are a fairly common aspect of the College’s degree students’ academic lives, and are available only to those at the Teachers College campus. The branch campus in Japan and the additional (offsite) programs at C.W. Post University and in Taiwan are distinct degree cohorts at other locations, and as such do not have access to some facilities available to students on campus. The six certificate programs are intended for non-degree students, although students in degree programs may take some of their courses. Finally, distance learning potentially cuts across all of the above programs: the College’s online courses are available to credit and non-credit students, and the offsite and certificate programs may use online learning in the future.

As reported in this chapter, the College offers a wealth of activities for its students and provides resources of great quality and quantity. The suggestions offered here aim for a more coordinated, efficient, and equitable use of these resources and activities. Specific recommendations for these different kinds of educational activity have been offered above. The recommendations that follow are meant to apply across all related educational programs and activities. Recommendations are developed in four areas: services and resources; planning and coordination; assessment; and, online learning.

- **Teachers College Services and Resources:** As a general principle, the College should move to ensure that all its students have access to the College services and resources they need to succeed. Currently, individuals participating in non-credit, non-degree programs or offerings do not have full access to library resources; further, as the current student information system does not capture non-credit participants as “students” these participants in our programs and offerings do not have access to other online resources that require University ID login. In the case of the three offsite programs, it is not clear whether students have access to the same kinds of workshops and basic skills sessions that on-campus students have. These issues require further consideration and possible amelioration.

- **Planning and Coordination:** As noted above (under CEO&I workshops and basic skills), planning and coordination of related educational activities require thought. Academic programs should take more responsibility for determining (with input from students and from instructors) what kinds of workshops are needed and how they might best fit into programs of study. They should also work more closely with the
College units that offer basic skills workshops to create policies for referring students to them and ensuring that students who need help get it.

- **Assessment of Offerings:** Assessment of these related educational activities has been uneven. For all of these activities, the College should consider implementing assessments that lead to improving offerings. They should keep in mind that academic programs can determine how and whether these offerings benefit students in their academic careers.

- **Online Learning:** Online learning is a different category from the other activities discussed here, yet it is not really a separate kind of activity, but a mode of learning and teaching. As such, it could be used as part of degree programs, part of non-degree programs and certificate programs, as workshops, and in offsite degree programs. Courses and programs might be offered entirely online without any face-to-face meetings, or they might be a mixture of face-to-face meetings and online activity. The ideal is to use online learning as and where appropriate to enhance any educational activity.

Thus far, the College has used online learning mainly in stand-alone online courses. In the past, a separate unit (the Distance Learning Project) planned and managed these courses, but they are in process of moving into the planning and management of academic programs. This change makes sense because it aims to make academic programs more knowledgeable about, and more responsible for, integrating online activity into their programs. To further this end, program faculty should be encouraged to study closely both the promise and the possible drawbacks of online learning so that they might plan which and how many of their courses should be given online, and how these courses should fit into students’ total academic programs.

Besides the individual online courses now offered, several other kinds of online activity should be investigated. One is the potential offered by combining face-to-face meeting with online activity. Another is the offering of workshops in online or mixed (face-to-face and online) modes. A third is the possibility of offsite degree programs using online learning—either activities created by their own faculty or sharing online activity used by the rest of the College. Fourth is the potential of entire degree programs that involve varying degrees of online learning, some possibly taking place entirely or almost entirely in an online environment.