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Chapter 1 – Executive Summary

Overview of the College

Founded in 1887 to provide a new kind of schooling for the teachers of poor, immigrant children in New York City, and affiliated with Columbia University since 1898 under an agreement whereby the College retained its legal and financial independence, Teachers College today is an urban, independent, graduate and professional school of education with curricula primarily in three broad areas - education, psychology, and health. A full discussion of the College’s mission is provided in Chapter 2. The College currently offers more than 75 programs of study that lead to the degrees of Master of Arts, Master of Science, Master of Education, Doctor of Education, and Doctor of Philosophy. To date, Teachers College has educated nearly 110,000 students from the United States and around the world.

The academic programs of the College are organized into academic departments, augmented by centers, institutes, and projects that compliment instructional areas with research, service, and experiential initiatives. For academic year 2011-12, the College will have ten departments: Arts and Humanities; Biobehavioral Sciences; Counseling and Clinical Psychology; Curriculum and Teaching; Educational Policy and Social Analysis; Health and Behavior Studies; Human Development; International and Transcultural Studies; Mathematics, Science, and Technology; and Organization and Leadership. Descriptions of each of the academic departments and programs are available online at http://www.tc.edu/academics/index.htm and in the Teachers College Catalog appended to this report.

For academic year 2010-11, the Faculty of Teachers College consisted of 153 full-time professorial faculty, of whom 112 (73%) were tenured and 41 (27%) were non-tenured. Of the full-time Faculty, 39 (25%) were minority and 86 (56%) were female. In addition to the full-time faculty, the instructional staff of the College included an additional 72 full-time appointments at the rank of Lecturer (44), Visiting Professor (6) and Instructor (22), as well as approximately 250 part-time appointments.

For the Fall 2010 term, the student body comprised 5,397 graduate students. Of that total, 3,631 (67.3%) were enrolled in masters’ programs, 1,472 (27.3%) were enrolled in doctoral programs, and 294 (5.4%) were non-degree students; 66.4% of all students were enrolled part-time. Of enrolled students who were United States citizens or resident aliens, 38.2% identified as members of racial or ethnic minority groups. International students, drawn from more than 85 different countries, comprised nearly 15.5% of the total student body. The age distribution of students enrolled at the College is multimodal, with 25% under age 25, 33% between ages 25-29, 18% between ages 30-34, and 25%...
over the age of 35. The median age of all students was 29. Additional information on student enrollments and demographics is provided in Appendices A and B.

Teachers College’s main campus is located in the Morningside Heights neighborhood of the upper west side of the Borough of Manhattan in New York City. The campus is bordered by West 120th Street, Broadway, West 122nd Street, and Amsterdam Avenue, and is comprised of seven academic buildings and five residential halls. The College also maintains two faculty residences, one on campus and one located on Morningside Drive and West 121st Street, one block east of campus.

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.

**Approach to the Preparation of the Periodic Review Report**

In May 2010, the Provost appointed a Steering Committee to lead the process of preparing the Periodic Review Report. The Steering Committee was composed of senior staff, faculty, and administration (see Appendix C for membership). The Steering Committee formed the Working Group composed of the Vice Provost, representatives of each of the three major administrative areas (Academic Affairs, Development and External Affairs, and Finance and Administration) and three directors of the offices of Admission, Accreditation and Assessment, and Institutional Studies. During the summer and fall of 2010, this group worked to collect and analyze relevant data, drawing upon the resources of several administrative and support offices, including Institutional Studies, Accreditation and Assessment, Human Resources, Budget and Planning, and Enrollment and Student Services. In the development of the report, input and review was frequently solicited from department chairs, program coordinators, faculty and staff from across the College. Final drafts of the report were reviewed by members of the Steering Committee, with comments and suggestions incorporated into the final version submitted here.

**Summary of Major Institutional Changes and Developments Since 2006**

**Appointment of new president.** The two College’s self-studies prior to the 2006 report used the Selected Topic model. As Teachers College had not undertaken a comprehensive self-study review for many years, the Teachers College Middle States Steering Committee, in consultation with the Commission, elected to pursue a comprehensive self-study. The study design was adapted for two additional considerations. First, due to major initiatives and commitments in the area of improving the student experience at the College, it was decided that the comprehensive review would incorporate an emphasis on the student experience. Second, at the early stages of our engagement with the self-study, then President Arthur Levine announced his decision to step down from the Presidency as of July 2006. Because of these two considerations we also approached our 2005-06 self-study as an opportunity to clarify and address critical issues of organization, process, program, and support services that would be essential both to sustaining the manifold progress the College had achieved over the past decade while also helping to assure a successful transition to new leadership.
Shortly after President Levine’s announcement of his pending departure, the Board of Trustees established a search committee, including representatives of the Board of Trustees and elected representatives of the Faculty, and with the assistance of the search firm Spencer Stuart, launched a national search to identify the 10th President of Teachers College. The search process was successfully concluded with the selection and appointment of Dr. Susan H. Fuhrman, then Dean of the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania and a PhD graduate of the Politics and Education program at Teachers College.

**Vision for Teachers College.** President Fuhrman officially began her tenure in August 2006. She outlined her vision for Teachers College in her inaugural address:

- We will assure that our work always addresses the most important questions and seeks to produce definitive answers about the most pressing problems of education and social policy.
- By emphasizing health and psychology along with education, we must represent the interdisciplinary approaches that educational problems inherently demand.
- By strengthening the link between research and practitioner education, we can ensure that educators will benefit from the latest discoveries about human learning.
- Building on our legacy also means that we would leave a legacy to our neighbors and our city. It’s imperative that we apply new insights and approaches to educational improvement especially close to home where there are great needs.
- We must take on responsibility for improving local schools and other educational settings by working closely with community and school partners. We have an historic commitment to equity and excellence in education. There’s no better place to demonstrate that commitment than here at home in our Harlem community.
- We must assure that our research reaches relevant policy and practitioner audiences. We must dedicate ourselves to applying our work in the most constructive ways toward making a real difference and delivering measurable improvement in outcomes for children.
- TC’s international work will become more significant through many enterprises: through our research on comparative education approaches; through our many exchanges that enable educators to study with the most groundbreaking scholars even if they reside across the globe; and through enhanced efforts on the ground to help other nations who request it to improve their educational systems and professional preparation programs.

This vision, which builds on and extends the historical legacy of the College and affirms its mission, has been translated into a set of institutional strategic goals which are described in more detail in Chapters 2 and 5.
Building a stronger organization - external reviews. To realize her vision and with the departure of the three incumbent Vice Presidents\(^2\), Susan Fuhrman’s first challenge was to build a new senior leadership team. After assuring interim leadership in each of the key administrative areas, President Fuhrman approached the challenge by undertaking separate, sequential reviews of Academic Affairs, Finance and Administration, and Development and External Affairs. The reviews were conducted by teams of external experts, each deeply familiar and experienced in the leadership and management of the respective areas. Each of the review teams was provided with an extensive array of documentary information and assessments of each area, and in the course of their on-site visits met broadly with constituent and stakeholder groups across the College. While the specific charge to each of the review teams varied in ways appropriate to each of the areas under review, the review teams were all charged with the task of evaluating each area/office’s organization and functioning with respect to its ability to meet its mission and to work collaboratively in support of each of the other areas in meeting the vision and mission of the College.

This approach was successful in at least two critical respects. First, informed by the assessments and recommendations from each of these reviews, each of the searches successfully recruited to the College leaders who were well qualified to meet the challenges and demands of their respective posts and to work collaboratively across areas to realize the mission and strategic goals of the College. Second, the process that shaped each of these searches established the President’s commitment to transparent, data-driven planning and decision making and was instrumental in affirming the importance of a culture of evidence.

A summary of the major institutional changes and developments since the decennial accreditation and reflective of the advice taken from the self-studies are as follows:

- Based on the external review of the Academic Affairs area, President Fuhrman reorganized the former Vice President for Academic Affairs office and modified the title to Provost and Dean of the College. These changes signaled that the Provost was a clear second in command and that the academic mission of the institution is paramount. Part of the reorganization plan also delegated more authority and responsibility to the departments. In Thomas James, a nationally known scholar with substantial academic administrative experience, who had most recently been serving as Dean of the School of Education at the University of North Carolina, the search attracted a leader with unparalleled experience and vision to lead the academic enterprise. Also, as part of the reorganization of functional areas and responsibilities, William Baldwin, with extensive prior service at TC and a wealth of institutional knowledge and breadth of higher education experiences, was appointed to fill the new role of Vice Provost (see Appendix D).

\(^2\) Darlyne Bailey, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean; Joe Brosnan, Vice President for Development and External Affairs; and Fred Schnur, Vice President of Finance and Administration all left the College to accept other positions early within the President’s first year.
• Based on the external review of the Finance and Administration area and the incredibly complex set of responsibilities that falls under this umbrella, the President appointed Harvey Spector as Vice President for Finance and Administration. Coming with a record of success in financial and operational leadership, most recently at the Fashion Institute of Technology, Mr. Spector has realigned these operating units to improve focus, clarity of mission, and operations. Mr. Spector made productive changes across all of the units—including increasing focus on financial practices and procedures in the Controller’s Office, clarifying the coordination of auxiliary services, facilities management and operations, and expanding the focus on public safety, among other areas.

• President Fuhrman, based on the external review and anticipating the prospect of a comprehensive campaign, appointed Suzanne Murphy as Vice President of Development and External Affairs. Ms. Murphy had previously led development at Sarah Lawrence and is also a TC alumna. Since her appointment, she has successfully reorganized operations and recruited key personnel, giving focus to Donor Relations/Stewardship, Government Relations, Advancement Services, Planned Giving, and Alumni Relations.

**Other significant organizational changes.** To advance the mission of the College, President Fuhrman made four additional appointments, elevating one existing office to Vice Presidential status and creating three new units.

President Fuhrman cemented the College’s work in the area of maintaining a diverse and supportive community by elevating the Office of Diversity and Community Affairs to Vice Presidential status and expanding the staff of the office to allow for increased capacity in the planning and administration of diversity and community programming.

In response to several pressing needs and the changing regulatory and compliance landscape within higher education, President Fuhrman created the Office of the General Counsel and appointed an attorney with significant experience representing universities and other major non-profit organizations as in-house counsel to head the office. The Office of the General Counsel supports the mission of the College by providing legal advice and counsel, serving as the College’s legal representative in litigation, administrative matters, and transactions, and retaining and overseeing outside counsel engaged on behalf of the College.

President Fuhrman brought with her a legacy of establishing strong relationships with local schools and early in her tenure established a College priority that the College should have a coordinated presence and significant impact in New York City schools. She established the Office of School and Community Partnerships to do groundbreaking work with K-12 schools and local districts and filled the post of Associate Vice President to take charge of that work.

Reorganizing both the historical legacy and the significant current opportunities in the international arena, and building on the recommendations of an external review,
President Fuhrman created the Office of International Affairs and recruited an Executive Director to implement the College’s international engagement in new, strategic ways.

In addition to these steps to build institutional capacity, President Fuhrman also introduced a new College-wide leadership structure. To respond to the concern that the operations of the College were too “silied,” she created the President’s Advisory Group (PAG), which brought together her Senior Staff (the VP’s for Academic Affairs, Finance and Administration, Development and External Affairs, Community and Diversity, as well as the Associate VP for School and Community Partnerships, the Vice Provost, the General Counsel, and the President’s Chief of Staff), with the ten academic department chairs, and the Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee. One of the primary purposes of PAG is to bring together leaders of the administration, the Faculty, and the academic departments to discuss the critical issues facing the College, and to do so in a collaborative and transparent fashion. In addition, PAG also serves as sounding board for all members to have the opportunity to propose or react to new policy or program proposals, facilitating communication and information sharing between and among key groups. Under the President’s leadership, the work of this group has shaped a management culture for the College of shared decision making among all senior managers, both academic and administrative, rather than to be operating on parallel tracks, or silos.

With her leadership staff and structure established, President Fuhrman began a process of enhancing the College’s historic role of combining groundbreaking scholarship and educational approaches with real-world impact. Each area has worked—individually, and in concert with one another—towards annually ascribed goals that strengthen the College and position it for continued leadership.

Abstract of Highlights of the PRR in Narrative Form

In addition to this Executive Summary, the subsequent sections of our report follow the format provided by the MSCHE Handbook. The 2006 site visit team report affirmed that the College had met all Standard and provided the College with four key recommendations, as well as a suite of suggestions. We address the MSCHE recommendations in Chapter 2 and most of the suggestions in Chapter 5 of this report. Chapter 3 reviews a set of topics drawn principally from the ongoing planning and assessment processes that inform the development and cyclic revision of the five-year financial plan. It is also informed by the first phases of an enterprise risk management assessment project that the College initiated during the fall 2010 semester. Chapter 4 describes the enrollment and financial climate at the College and provides past, current and projected enrollment tied to financial projections. Audited financial statements, the institutional financial plan, and IPEDS financial information reports are provided electronically along with this report. Chapter 5 provides a detailed description of the College-wide assessment processes as described in *Institutional Plan for the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness* and the *Institutional Plan for the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes* (Appendices E and F). The final section, Chapter 6, provides a summary of the College’s financial plan.
The appendices include a variety of materials in support of this report: 2010-2011 Catalog (provided on disk and also available online at www.tc.edu/academics/catalog.htm), institutional financial plans 2011-15 and 2012-16, operating budget 2011, audited financial statements 2008 (with management letter), 2009 and 2010, financial section submitted to IPEDS for 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11, Middle States Institutional profiles 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10 and 2010-11 and several additional documents referenced within the PRR.
Chapter 2 – Summary of Responses to Recommendations

The 2006 MSCHE Site Visit Report affirmed that the College had met all Standards and provided the College with four key recommendations (under Standards 7, 11, and 14), as well as a suite of related suggestions to assist and focus the work of the College following our self-study. Additionally, in a letter dated November 7, 2006, the Commission reiterated the importance of developing and implementing a campus-wide assessment plan, including assessment of institutional effectiveness and assessment of student learning.

The sections which follow provide a response to these recommendations. In addition, as many of the suggestions were responses to our invitation to the site visit team to assist us in clarifying important issues of organization, process, program, and support services as we approached transitions in presidential and senior leadership, in Chapter 5 we have also incorporated our responses to a number of the suggestions provided by the site visit team.

In the sections below we have organized our responses under three primary headings: Institutional Vision and Mission, Institutional Assessment Plan, and Assessment of Student Learning. Included in the third section is a response to the site visit team’s recommendation to implement an approach to periodic program evaluation.

Institutional Vision and Mission

Although the concern about the clarity of intuitional mission, particularly, in relation to the Campaign for Educational Equity was identified as a suggestion by the MSCHE visiting team, the follow-up letter (November 7, 2006) re-emphasized the need for the College to address this concern in its Periodic Review Report. In this section, we discuss how Teachers College’s historical mission evolved over time and, particularly, how the new President, building on the College’s legacy and the achievements of the previous administration, has moved the College’s mission forward.

Though significantly evolved, the current mission of the College remains closely connected to the founding principle, which was to "provide a new kind of schooling for New York City's poor, one dedicated to helping them improve the quality of their everyday lives." From early on, this mission has been viewed broadly as education writ large, taking in the life of communities, families and other educative influences along with life in classrooms and schools. Today, Teachers College is a graduate and professional school, focusing on education, health and human development in and out of the classroom and across the lifespan. 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. The College is committed 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 of research, teaching and service, and its encouragement and support of all individuals in the achievement of their full potential.

In accomplishing its mission through programs of teaching, research and service, the
College draws upon the expertise of a diverse community of faculty across a wide range of disciplines and scholarly backgrounds including education, applied psychology, social sciences, humanities, and health, as well as students and staff from across the country and around the world. Approaching education as broadly defined - i.e., focusing on human development, in and out of the classroom, and across the lifespan - Teachers College engages in programs of research, teaching, and service through six principal activities:

- Research on the critical issues facing education;
- Preparation of the next generation of leaders for education;
- Education of the current generation of leaders in policy and practice;
- Creation of demonstration projects and institutions modeling effective practice and outcomes;
- Development of public discourse and policy in education; and,
- Improvement of practice in educational institutions.

Through these activities, Teachers College continues to pursue its historic mission of educational improvement while at the same time generating new knowledge, discovering innovative models of practice and professional development, and helping to devise more effective policies, systems and institutions to increase levels of learning and human development for all learners across the lifespan.

As discussed in Chapter 1, President Fuhrman officially began her tenure in August, 2006. She outlined her vision for Teachers College in her inaugural address:

- We will assure that our work always addresses the most important questions and seeks to produce definitive answers about the most pressing problems of education and social policy.
- By emphasizing health and psychology along with education, we must represent the interdisciplinary approaches that educational problems inherently demand.
- By strengthening the link between research and practitioner education, we can ensure that educators will benefit from the latest discoveries about human learning.
- Building on our legacy also means that we would leave a legacy to our neighbors and our city. It’s imperative that we apply new insights and approaches to educational improvement especially close to home where there are great needs.
- We must take on responsibility for improving local schools and other educational settings by working closely with community and school partners. We have an historic commitment to equity and excellence in education. There’s no better place to demonstrate that commitment than here at home in our Harlem community.
- We must assure that our research reaches relevant policy and practitioner audiences. We must dedicate ourselves to applying our work in the most constructive ways toward making a real difference and delivering measurable improvement in outcomes for children.
- Teachers College’s international work will become more significant through many enterprises: through our research on comparative education approaches; through our many exchanges that enable educators to study with the most
groundbreaking scholars even if they reside across the globe; and through enhanced efforts on the ground to help other nations who request it to improve their educational systems and professional preparation programs.

This vision, which builds on and extends the historical legacy of the College, also clarifies and affirms its mission.

The follow-up correspondence from the Commission also focused attention on the importance of clarifying the mission in a way that effectively mobilizes all disciplines at the College, including health, psychology, arts and humanities, among others. This mobilization across programs and disciplines has been pursued along several fronts. First, the approach taken by the Provost and President in implementing academic program planning and review, while initially situating the process within the academic departments and programs, then expanded the process in subsequent phases to emphasize more open, collaborative, cross-program and cross-disciplinary reviews and discussions of the ideas and potential initiatives that had emerged from the initial stage of program review conversations. In addition to reinforcing the institution’s commitment to transparent, evidence-based decision-making processes, one of the important outcomes of this approach was the cross-program and cross-disciplinary engagement of faculty in advancing the College’s mission.

The broader engagement of programs across disciplines in the mission of the College was also fostered by the creation of a new governing body: the President’s Advisory Group (PAG) as discussed in detail in Chapter 1. This group brought together leaders of the administration, the faculty, and the academic departments to discuss the critical issues facing the College, and to do so in a collaborative and transparent fashion. The PAG meetings also serve as an important venue for monitoring progress on the achievement of institutional goals.

Lastly, the recommendations provided in the Commission’s letter (November 7, 2006) urged the College to clarify the relationship between the institutional mission and the Campaign for Educational Equity. In the context of the articulated vision for the College, and the reaffirmation of its core mission, a review was undertaken of the status and evolution of the Campaign for Education Equity, the focus of which was to promote excellence in education and to overcome the gap in educational access and achievement between advantaged and disadvantaged students throughout the United States. The review underscored that it was essential to assure that the initiatives and activities that defined the Campaign, which are essential to the core principles and activities of the College, were indeed integrated within the central activities of the College. The key point in this assessment is “within”: the activities that defined the Campaign had evolved in such a way that even by the 2005-06 self study they were operating outside the mainstream of the College, almost as a stand-alone project. The mission of the College remains sharply focused on 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, and the work undertaken through the Campaign is an important dimension of the College’s efforts to achieve that mission.
Institutional Assessment Plan (Standard 7)

Although the team found that the College was engaged in multiple forms of assessment and that it was actively scaling up assessment of student learning outcomes, it recommended that the College develop and implement a written assessment plan that links planning to decision-making, budgeting and to institutional assessment.

As noted by the site visitors, Teachers College has a well-established and active program of assessment directed at evaluating institutional effectiveness, academic program effectiveness, and student learning. Responsibility for the oversight of the assessment of institutional effectiveness is shared by the Office of the President (including the Offices of Community and Diversity, of School and Community Partnerships, of International Affairs, and of General Counsel) and three Vice Presidents (Provost and Dean of the College, Finance and Administration, and Development and External Affairs). Each academic and administrative unit within the College is responsible for design and implementation of regular and systematic assessment activities to gauge achievement of the unit’s mission and goals and the unit’s contribution to the College’s mission and goals.

Following the MSCHE recommendation and based on the results of the extensive reviews conducted in 2006-2008, Teachers College’s extensive assessment program was outlined in two documents: the Institutional Plan for the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness (AIE) (Appendix E), which focused primarily on assessment processes in non-academic units, and the Institutional Plan for the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (ASLO) (Appendix F), which outlines the processes for the assessment of student learning and assessment of academic programs. It is the intention of both Assessment Plans to add structure and accountability to the many diverse assessment processes and projects, yet be flexible enough to allow individual academic and non-academic units to conduct assessments according to the unit’s needs and changing contexts. This section focuses on the AIE document, the ASLO document will be described in the next section.

The AIE document is a fully inclusive document which describes college-wide assessment activities as well as assessment activities under the auspices of the individual vice presidents who are each members of the College’s senior staff. The Plan starts with providing a definition and guiding principles for assessment that are shared by all parties involved and describing a culture of evidence that has been initiated and nurtured by the College’s senior leadership. The next part of the Plan describes the College’s mission; institutional goals derived from this mission and reflecting a reiterative and collaborative planning process; examples of unit missions and goals, which not only demonstrate consistency with the College’s mission and goals but also elaborate and provide necessary detail to the latter; and the process for monitoring and assessing performance and progress towards achieving the College’s and units’ goals.

The last three sections of the AIE describe the assessment process (setting clear goals and objectives, establishing assessment methods, assessing progress towards goals, using information for improving, and sharing information with internal and external
stakeholders), roles and responsibilities, and timelines. The key feature of the AIE is the use of common templates for the assessment of progress and performance which reduce fragmentation and present a cohesive framework of the institutional assessment activities.

Assessment of Student Learning (Standards 11 and 14)

Expectations of student learning at institutional, program and course levels. In response to the MSCHE review team’s recommendation that the College articulate expectations of student learning at institutional, degree/program and course levels and based on the results of the academic self-studies conducted in 2007-09, Teachers College identified its expectations of student learning. These student learning outcomes are directly informed by Teachers College’s mission and core values, as well as by the missions of academic departments and degree programs. While education and training models can vary widely based on the discipline/field and degree level, Teachers College is committed to ensuring that all students, regardless of their chosen field or degree program, receive systematic instruction and demonstrate achievement in the five competency areas (CAs):

- Professional practice: Demonstrate mastery of the content and methodologies of their discipline or profession.
- Research, scholarship, and inquiry: Use skills of inquiry, research, critical thinking, and problem solving to pursue and evaluate knowledge.
- Professionalism, lifelong learning, and professional development: Engage in professional discourse and take responsibility for one’s personal and professional growth.
- Communication, collaboration, and leadership: Demonstrate effective communication, collaboration and leadership skills to convert goals and commitments into action.
- Diversity, multiculturalism, advocacy, and social justice: Appreciate diversity, understand nature and causes of injustice, and take actions to promote a better world.

Each academic degree program mapped the five CAs to program-level goals and outcomes, and, in turn, to core course objectives within the programs. Thus, individual program goals and outcomes, as well as core courses, clinical experiences and other learning opportunities, are clearly tied to the College’s mission and the five CAs. The Faculty Handbook (section 7.C.) suggests that faculty include a statement about the identified learning objectives/learning outcomes in their course syllabi.

Institutional plan for the assessment of student learning outcomes. In designing a College-wide process for the assessment of student learning outcomes, we followed the approach adopted by Columbia University at large and used the University’s principles to guide us in the development of our assessment plans for the College and for individual programs:

- The creation of plans to assess student learning outcomes should be decentralized to the individual programs. Teachers College is too complex and its educational programming is too diverse to create a standardized College-wide
format for outcomes measurement. The role of the central structure that we create should be confined to assisting the programs in developing their plans and overseeing the work to ensure that it meets accreditation requirements.

- **The process of creating plans to assess student learning outcomes should be managed by the faculty.** To be meaningful, learning assessment should be tied to the development and management of the individual programs. It should, therefore, be done by the same faculty who have designed and staff our programs, with support and guidance of their department chairs and College’s support offices.

- **The plans to assess student learning outcomes should draw as much as possible upon the methods the faculty already use to evaluate how well their students are learning.** The faculty have already invested considerable effort into designing methods appropriate to their disciplines that test the educational effectiveness of their programs. They should be encouraged to build upon these efforts, augmenting them, when necessary, with additional forms of measurement and further processes for using the data they collect to strengthen the programming they offer. In particular, it may not be necessary for those programs that have created learning outcome assessment plans to satisfy their disciplinary accreditation agencies to do more than simply review those plans against the requirements of the College-wide process.

- **The goals of the plans to assess student learning outcomes should be to create mechanisms that enhance the quality of the education we offer rather than merely to comply with external requirements.** Learning outcomes tend to have a bad reputation in higher education, except among those who study them as an academic specialization. To the extent that they are familiar with the subject, faculty usually view learning outcomes plans as burdensome, bureaucratic, and an intrusion into the management of the academic programs. Their resistance is understandable but unfortunate since there is potentially substantial educational value to be gained by systematically collecting data on student learning and using this information to improve our programming.

In agreement with these principles, particularly with the third principle above, we devoted considerable time and effort to auditing the diverse assessment practices that had already been in place in the College’s programs. As a result, our Institutional Plan for the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes is a compilation of individual program assessment plans unified by the common expectations for student learning (i.e., the five competency areas described above) and common assessment plan templates which are flexible enough to allow individual academic programs to conduct assessments according to the needs of their students, to the specifics of their disciplines or professional fields, and to their changing contexts.

The ASLO plan establishes a roadmap for all activities related to student learning outcomes assessment at Teachers College. The plan clarifies the College’s rationale for undertaking outcomes assessment and provides coordination for the broad range of learning activities carried out by the academic departments and programs. The Plan starts with the definition of learning outcome assessment, a description of the College’s
approach to assessing student learning and developing the SLOA plan, and a list of assessment principles developed by the American Association for Higher Education, which articulate the values and expectations for enhancing and institutionalizing a culture of assessment around the College and within individual programs.

The next section of the ASLO plan describes Teachers College’s mission, degree programs and institutional expectations for student learning. It also provides examples of program-level learning goals, learning and training opportunities designed to achieve these goals and outcomes, as well as methods and processes used to monitor and assess student progress and achievement.

The final chapters of the ASLO plan describe the steps in the implementation of the college-wide assessment process (including development of program assessment plans, selection of assessment measures, data collection and analysis, use of assessment results, and dissemination and reporting), roles and responsibilities and timelines. The audit of the college-wide assessment practices demonstrated that our academic programs, particularly our teacher education and psychology programs, have already invested considerable effort into designing sophisticated systems to assess their student learning. The college-wide process is designed to encourage all academic programs to build upon their existing processes, augmenting them, where necessary, with additional forms of measurement, and emphasizing the use of the assessment results component by documenting the links between assessment results and improvements made to the programs based on such results.

**Program Evaluation**

The site visit team recommended implementing an approach to periodic program evaluation that would strengthen Teachers College’s existing processes and potentially provide a framework to integrate existing assessments into an institutional plan.

In 2007-09, under the leadership of the Provost and Dean of the College, Teachers College undertook an in-depth review process of all academic programs and departments. The first phase of this collaborative and collegial by design process, was to assess the current state of each program based on a variety of data, including but not limited to admission and enrollment, student faculty ratios, faculty research productivity, teaching and advising, financial viability, etc. The second phase engaged faculty from within and across programs and external reviewers into a forward-looking inquiry about the College’s and programs’ missions vis-à-vis the developments in the society at large and in the professional and educational fields that the College serves. The review process sought to clarify the resource allocation and support needs essential to ensure that the College continues to realize its mission of educational improvement while at the same time generating new knowledge, discovering innovative models of practice and professional development, and helping to devise more effective policies and systems to increase levels of learning and human development for all learners across the lifespan. The use of results from the academic self-studies is described in detail in Chapter 5 of this document.
The academic self-studies, along with the self-studies of the major administrative areas described in Chapter 1, served as a foundation for identifying the College’s institutional goals and, consequently, for the development of the two College-wide documents: the Institutional Plan for the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness and the Institutional Plan for the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes.

As described in the AEI plan, Teachers College’s goal to provide high quality academic programs (2.1) is realized through two main strategies: to regularly and systematically review academic programs and to assess student learning outcomes and use assessment results to inform curriculum and teaching. The College routinely collects and analyzes the following performance measures and indicators to evaluate the quality of its academic programs: application and enrollment statistics (including by demographics), retention and graduation rates, faculty teaching productivity and course load analysis, student learning outcome assessments, grade distribution analysis (as needed), course evaluations, Student Satisfaction and Exit Surveys, Alumni Feedback Survey, and professional accreditation status analyses. The College employs a number of mechanisms and processes to review these data and integrate the findings into planning and resource allocation:

- The annual review and approval of requests to recruitment for new faculty positions includes current and multi-year data at the college, department, and program levels on: degree student enrollments; tuition revenue generated by department and program majors; student faculty ratios; degrees awarded; application, admission and new student enrollments; and, analysis of current year summer/fall admissions and enrolment data.
- Program admission trends and student faculty ratios are monitored and scrutinized in an ongoing enrollment planning and management process.
- Faculty annual reports, along with institutionally reported data on effectiveness in teaching and advising, are utilized in several ways: facilitating reports for accrediting agencies; generating information to understand more deeply aspects of faculty workload, particularly service and outreach; facilitating the faculty mentoring program; and, identifying opportunities for collaboration around program development and sponsored research.
- The results of course evaluation are shared with program faculty to assist in improving future course offerings. The results are also used by the department chairs to provide mentoring and additional support to new instructors or instructors struggling with certain aspects of teaching.
- The quality of educational offerings is ensured at the program and individual course level through program and course approval mechanisms. All courses offered by the College must be accompanied by a course syllabus. This is a required item for the initial course approval and all faculty are asked to submit updated course syllabi to their Department Academic Administrators annually.
- The mission and goals of each academic program, as well as admission and degree requirements, are described in the Teachers College Catalog and in the Program of Study Guides which are updated annually.
The ASLO plan describes in detail how assessment of student learning outcomes is integrated into evaluation of program effectiveness through an annual review of student learning outcomes assessment results by faculty and department chairs. It also describes a variety of external reviews that affect Teachers College academic programs, including those by the New York State Education Department, national and specialty professional associations, and by the Columbia University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.
Chapter 3 - Challenges and Opportunities

Introduction

The challenges and opportunities discussed in this Chapter are drawn principally from the ongoing planning and assessment processes that inform the development and cyclic revision of the five-year financial plan, and is also informed by the first phases of an enterprise risk management assessment project that the College initiated during the Fall 2010 semester. This initial section is organized around enrollment and a set of related factors that all contribute to the challenge of meeting our enrollment goals and subsequent sections review challenges and opportunities in the following areas: external research funding, the College’s physical facilities, the Campaign for Teachers College, school and community partnerships, international affairs, the relationship between Teachers College and Columbia University and leadership succession planning.

Enrollment

Teachers College, like many institutions of higher education, is financially dependent upon revenue generated by enrollment. This one revenue stream supports approximately 73% of the College’s annual operating budget. Enrollment is clearly a critically important component in the Five-Year Financial Plan as that plan projects that the College will retain the substantial portion of FY2011 enrollment and tuition revenue growth, with enrollment growing by 1% in each of the three following years, before leveling off in FY2015.

While the enrollment climate at Teachers College can currently be characterized as robust, healthy and highly diverse, the College’s ability to realize these enrollment projections are a function, in part, of successfully addressing an interrelated set of opportunities and challenges. While the enrollment and application trends at the College over the past five years have been very strong, we have taken a conservative approach to projecting enrollment for the next four years as part of the College’s financial plan in part due to several factors. Some of the specifics - economic recession and sluggish recovery, particularly in teaching and other public sector employment in urban areas; other market shifts that are affecting demand in some of our larger programs; reductions in external training grant funding in several program areas - are discussed later in this report. In this section we approach the issue more broadly: our success in realizing the enrollment growth projections undergirding our Five Year Financial Plan will be a function of our success in continuing to mount high quality programs of instruction, research, and

1 “Enterprise Risk Management” is an umbrella term which encompasses the assessment of both “downside and upside” institutional risks across several fronts (in terms of both likelihood that a given risk might be realized and magnitude of potential impact if that risk were realized), as well as the development of a response plan (including the determination of strategies and the monitoring of both risks and related opportunities). In the Fall of 2010, the Senior Staff of Teachers College launched a project to develop an ERM assessment and plan. Preliminary outcomes of this work inform the discussions of challenges and opportunities.

2 Refer to discussion in Chapter 4 – Enrollment and Finance Trends and Projections.
service. In turn, this presents two central challenges: on the one hand, recruiting, retaining, and supporting the professional development of a highly qualified and diverse Faculty; and, on the other, recruiting, enrolling and retaining to completion a highly qualified and diverse student body.

**Program quality: recruiting, retaining and supporting faculty.** The quality of the College’s academic offerings is of paramount importance. One of the factors that allow Teachers College to remain strong is the ability to recruit and retain the very best faculty members.

Teachers College has academic leaders of great national distinction on its Faculty, and it has newer faculty who are establishing themselves as leaders in their respective fields. This preeminence supports the College’s reputation and influence, but it also exposes the College to risk if key people are lost through retirements or outside offers from other institutions. Some of the most aggressive recruiting efforts actually target faculty groups, taking senior, mid-level and junior faculty simultaneously to build centers and institutes elsewhere, and even the greatest universities can experience devastating losses in key fields. Some of the College’s leading senior faculty members are simply not replaceable.

This broad challenge is underscored by the pattern of faculty departures and recruitments since our 2005-06 self-study. When we undertook our self-study, the professorial faculty numbered 152, of which 106 (70%) were tenured, 90 (59%) were female, and 32 (21%) were identified as racial or ethnic minority group members. In 2010-11, as we prepare our PRR, professorial faculty number 153, of which 112 (73%) are tenured, 86 (56%) are female, and 39 (25%) are identified as racial or ethnic minority group members. While the data from these two points in time might suggest little change -- a slight shift in the gender distribution of the faculty, an important but modest increase in the number and percentage of faculty identified as members of racial or ethnic minority groups, and an overall increase of only one additional appointee in faculty rank -- the reality was much more dynamic: from 2005-06 through 2010-11, including anticipated faculty departures at the conclusion of this year as well as anticipated new faculty coming to the College for the 2011-12 academic year, the College will have faced the departure of 50 faculty, and the recruitment of 51 new faculty to the College.3

In these contexts, our challenge is that we must develop adequate support to keep such people who continue to be tremendously productive, and to keep from losing younger rising stars whose trajectories make them attractive to the best institutions in the country. Further, with high tuition and the high cost of living in New York City, academic quality is necessary to justify coming to Teachers College as a student rather than going to many other fine institutions that cost less. On the research side, disciplined inquiry is an arduous and sustained effort that requires strong intellectual leadership. An erosion of

---

3 Coupled with an existing phased retirement incentive program, a recent change in the College’s retiree health benefit program (which provides eligible faculty with the opportunity to retain certain benefits only by retiring by August 31, 2013) may significantly impact the challenge the College will face to recruit or retain a cadre of highly qualified faculty.
mentors and those generating breakthrough methods and findings would harm the productivity, the reputation, and the capacity of the academic structure at Teachers College.

We have and will continue to be engaged in a number of steps to maximize our recruitment and retention abilities:

- Use the soon to be formally announced Campaign for Teachers College (discussed later in the chapter) to increase faculty support and develop high-priority initiatives that will enable our academic leaders to build networks that can sustain and enhance the College’s productivity and impact. This strategy is well incorporated into the campaign planning.
- Coordinate recruitment of new faculty to strengthen the capacity for succession, not only in academic program leadership but across centers and institutes of great value to the College. This strategy is less well developed at the mid-career level than it is at present in recruiting junior faculty.
- Selectively recruit new senior faculty who can help to launch major initiatives, mentor younger faculty, and build the resource base for sustained work at the highest level in key fields. This strategy is a focal point of the endowed chairs in the Campaign for Teachers College. We are focusing, for example, on the theme of cognition, learning and technology as one area in which senior leadership recruitment is a priority.
- Create strong counter-offers and retention packages to retain faculty sought by other universities. So far, we have been successful in pursuing this strategy, and it has allowed us to keep critically important faculty in fields centrally important to the mission of Teachers College.

With careful and dedicated response, the risk can be minimized, but we may still confront some disruption in key fields such as economics of education and cognitive psychology unless we accelerate our response as our senior scholars approach retirement.

**Maintaining market share.** As stated earlier, Teachers College is financially dependent upon tuition revenue which supports approximately 73% of the College’s annual operating budget. The College has the ability to adjust to modest year-over-year declines in enrollment by reducing expenses and/or taking other interim measures. Furthermore, in response to mid-term declines in program-specific enrollments, the College can sustain core operations until new programs are brought online. However, a loss in market share, i.e., where enrollment at Teachers College in specific fields or programs drop disproportionately to that of our competitors, would create a fundamental and potentially serious challenge to the College’s long-term financial viability even if initial declines in enrollment are modest. Our current assessment is that, given market forces (including demographic changes and economic trends), it is likely that the College may see modest shifts in enrollment in specific programs (for example, teacher preparation at specific grade level and/or subject areas), but it is not likely that we will see a disproportionate loss of market share compared to our competitors.
In this context, the challenges and opportunities that we face can be differentiated into three categories. The first focuses on the challenges of maintaining market share in the mix of current programs that we currently have, the second focuses on the need to create the additional capacity necessary to respond adroitly to opportunities in new and emerging areas that are consonant with the mission of the College and the third is finding the appropriate balance between the demands of tuition dependency and affordability.

**Maintaining market share in current programs.** It will be a challenge, but absolutely paramount, that the College maintain its market share in current programs. Losing significant enrollment in any number of programs could create a very large and sustained enrollment decline. Using what has been learned from the external reviews and self-studies, the College has corrected perceived weaknesses in content areas (e.g., hiring faculty to fill gaps), reviewed program curricula carefully to ensure that we are adequately keeping pace with changes in practice, and making sure that students are aware of the College’s renewed commitment to support them financially.

The need to be aware of and open to needed change has been a steady topic of conversation over the last few years within the Teachers College community and has manifested itself in concrete steps to strengthen faculty, undertake and complete curricula reviews, expand the College’s footprint in the media both nationally and internationally and elevate awareness of the College’s perceived role in molding educational policy. The Provost continues to work with department chairs and program coordinators to ensure that these opportunities are seized.

**Respond adroitly to market needs in new and emerging areas.** Like many higher education leadership teams, we have accepted the fact that change and the ever constant need to reinvent components of an organization are inevitable. In order to maintain a competitive advantage, the need to introduce change must be efficiently analyzed, strategies quickly developed, embraced, and effectively pursued.

The departmental self-study and external review process identified a number of “big ideas” for College-wide consideration and collaboration. A series of domain dinners brought faculty from across the College together to discuss the themes or ideas that unite them and propel the College forward. Among the results of these efforts are new degree programs (in organizational psychology and diabetes education management), a new academic department (the Department of Education Policy and Social Analysis, which will launch formally this Fall), and the identification of themes that will guide the College’s fundraising.

**Tuition dependency and affordability.** Another dimension of the broad challenge to meet enrollment goals requires balancing demands from tuition dependency, on the one hand, and affordability on the other. The College is simultaneously dependent on tuition revenue (as described in the preceding discussions) and the need to remain affordable (both because of a commitment to ensuring affordability for a diverse student body and the need to remain competitive in the market place).
In order to remain competitive while providing sufficient operating resources, the College must continually assess and evaluate the markets within which the College and its programs compete to ensure that tuition is priced competitively with respect to our primary peer/competing institutions and as low as possible (to ensure maximum affordability) while also ensuring sufficient income to keep the College on a sound financial footing. Over the last several years, the College has invested resources in developing our ability to do analyses of market forces and trends to ensure that we price our services effectively: increasing focus on institutional research, assessment, enrollment management, and strategic budgeting has allowed us to be more effective in these efforts, and we are confident in this capacity as we move forward.

Enrollment goals for the College are not solely focused on overall enrolment levels. We are committed to recruiting and retaining a diverse and highly able student population. We are also committed to continuing to successfully sculpt the enrollment composition of the College toward a larger base of students who are enrolled at the masters level, with a larger proportion of those students enrolled on a full-time or nearly full-time basis, with a concomitant shift in doctoral level enrollments toward a smaller number of doctoral students, across targeted programs and disciplines, who are enrolled on a full-time basis and supported through competitive, multiyear scholarship and fellowship packages.

To realize these goals, the College must invest in financial aid, and implement the most effective and efficient policies and practices for the award of that aid.

With respect to the level of investment, from FY2005 through FY2010, resources devoted to financial aid from a multitude of sources (i.e., operating budget, grants and contracts, endowment, and restricted gifts) increased from $11.7 million in FY2005 to $17.4 million in FY2010. While the amount of financial aid given to students over this period increased by 48%, adjusted for tuition increases over the same period, the overall increase is 15%, or roughly the equivalent of $2.3 million more in aid awarded in FY2010 than there would have been if aid was kept constant at the FY2005 level.

Increasing financial aid resources has also been an institutional fundraising priority, targeting both expendable and endowed scholarships and fellowships. The College has employed different strategies to enhance these fundraising efforts, including the development of a directed giving program for scholarship funds via the Annual Fund, adding student support as a key element in grant proposals, and prioritizing scholarship solicitations both prior to and in the early stages of the upcoming comprehensive campaign. Since 2006, more than $43.28 million has been raised in new scholarship and fellowship commitments, and more than $31.37 million in cash from those commitments have been received to date. Of the $43.28 million raised, $9.03 million of the scholarship funds were expendable (21 percent), with the remaining $34.25 million designated for endowment (79 percent).

As currently composed, the planned campaign calls for $110 million to be raised for financial aid to our students - 31% of the total campaign goal of $350 million, and the largest funding priority for the campaign. This reflects both the dual objectives of
continuing to make the College more accessible and affordable for our students, and also providing full funding for a smaller cohort of top-flight doctoral students in order to remain competitive with our peer institutions.

Our ability to compete effectively for the students we most want to enroll also depends on the continuing importance of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the processes underlying the allocation and award of our limited scholarship and fellowship resources. To that end, the College undertook a comprehensive review - utilizing data from the 2006-07 and 2007-08 award cycles - to map the range of current practices and to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of those practices in recruiting and enrolling students who were awarded scholarship aid. The outcomes of that review have led to:

- A range of process and practice transformations that have improved the integration of admission and financial aid award decisions;
- More effective models allowing for the award of larger amounts of scholarship and fellowship resources in initial award cycles to adjust for varying patterns of award acceptance by prospective students;
- The investment of additional scholarship funds in the scholarship pools awarded centrally; and,
- The development and implementation of a predictive model for the award of those additional funds that have increased their effectiveness in enrolling highly qualified and diverse students, who were unlikely to enroll without financial aid.

**Academic Program Innovation and Experimentation**

Supporting and providing appropriate space for innovation and experimentation are key to the conceptualization, development, and implementation of new, cutting edge programs and lines of research and inquiry. At the time of our self-study, and for the decade preceding, one of the primary vehicles charged with responsibility for supporting innovation in the academic program was the Center for Educational Outreach and Innovation (CEO&I) and an affiliated project, Teachers College Innovations (TCI). An internal review preceding our 2005-06 self-study had surfaced concerns related to the performance of these units, and led to the appointment of a new Executive Director, and a refocusing of the unit’s mission and goals with particular emphasis on partnering with academic departments, faculty members, and graduate students to expand the reach and impact of the College, and focus that collaboration on the creation and expansion of new innovative programs and program formats to reach new audiences across the lifespan.

In 2008-09 an extensive analysis of the effectiveness of CEO&I/TCI in meeting these objectives was undertaken. The research team examined current activities, reviewed options for carrying these activities forward, presented specific recommendations for action and reviewed key considerations for supporting innovation at the College moving forward.

Following the review, and broader consultation across the College with key stakeholders, the decision was made to disband the unit as its operations had not been successful in meeting the expectations of the business model, nor in systematically fostering
innovation and experimentation that leveraged the interests and intellectual capacity of the faculty and academic programs to reach new audiences. The College implemented several interim measures to assure that successful projects were sustained while also building capacity to support new program development and innovation. Specifically, established initiatives (centers, certificate programs, institutes, degrees) were maintained but relocated, organizationally and administratively, to the appropriate academic departments in order to facilitate closer connection and integration with academic programs while also providing for improved budgetary oversight and management. Additionally, basic administrative services and support functions (such as marketing, registration, online/media/technology support and development) which had been housed within CEO&I/TCI were incorporated into the College’s existing administrative and support service units, with an emphasis on improving the effectiveness of service delivery from those units.

These were essentially maintenance activities that sustained a small number of programmatically and financially viable initiatives. Looking to the future, the College continues to support and encourage innovation that leverages intellectual capacity and interests of our faculty and academic programs in several complimentary ways. For example, EdLab, a division of the Gottesman Libraries (http://edlab.tc.columbia.edu/), engages in conceptual development, demonstration projects, and new educational research to explore and document diverse possibilities for the future of education. It pursues this mission by involving scholars and educators at Teachers College and around the world in a continuing conversation and the work is shaped by an evolving assessment of ongoing changes in the conditions for education. EdLab functions as a research, design, and development unit at the College and it serves the College by piloting knowledge projects. To generate as well as support innovation at the College, the EdLab also engages in the development of what might be called an “innovation infrastructure,” capabilities that will support new ways of doing teaching, research, and service.

The Provost also brought a visiting committee to campus in the fall term to help the College think about strategies for expanding nontraditional and noncredit programming. In 2010 a Professor of Practice with expertise in this area was hired to lead the Executive Masters Program in Organizational Psychology and to work directly with the Provost as a senior advisor to provide the College with high-level leadership in identifying new markets and developing innovative programming to reach those markets with noncredit offerings. Using a design team created under the auspices of the Office of the Provost, several prototypes were developed in 2010-11, each combining online and face-to-face engagement and each designed to reach and serve new populations of students and professions. As pilots, the activities were intended to inform future choices regarding more substantive investments.

Work has been launched on two of the pilots: through a collaboration between EdLab and the Center for New Media Technology and Learning at the University, developing a suite of online support tools for new teachers; and, through the Department of Organization and Leadership, an expansion of the current coaching program (jointly sponsored by Teachers College and the Columbia University Business School) and the potential extension of successful executive cohort programs into other markets.
Actively supporting experimentation, innovation and creativity in directions that show academic and fiscal promise is part of the College’s plan to move forward with these initial pilots. Assessment of past successes and failures has taught the College a great deal about costs and benefits, and in this time of fiscal restraint it is more important than ever to consistently use assessment measures and act quickly and nimbly to respond to what is learned from these assessments.

The preceding sections have focused on the challenges and opportunities associated with assuring that the College realizes the enrollment and tuition revenue expectations that are core elements of the Five Year Financial Plan. The following sections turn to a range of other opportunities and challenges that demand our attention over the next several years.

External Research Funding

Teachers College produces groundbreaking scholarship on a wide range of topics, much of which is supported by funding from external sources. There are abundant signs that external funding is becoming more difficult to acquire in support of research, training and technical assistance, and outreach initiatives of the College. Because of funding cuts, it is now more difficult than ever before for faculty to succeed in gaining funding for projects from major agencies such as the National Institutes of Health, even when proposals receive high scores that in the past would have assured funding. Foundation funds, curtailed by the recession and not yet bouncing back in the slow recovery, are not only tighter (with the possible exception of the centrally managed initiatives and advocacy of large foundations such as Gates and Lumina), but they are also moving toward providing lower overhead and requiring more matching funds from institutions, which means that external funding can have the net effect of drawing resources from the core academic budget.

A drop in external funding would limit opportunities for faculty and student research, field work, and collaboration. Such a decrease would also negatively affect our rankings as an institution and as individual programs within their respective fields. Our business model would become even more tuition-dependent than it already is, which would make us more vulnerable amidst the vicissitudes market shifts and competition from other providers of professional education.

We declared the 2010-11 academic year as our “Year of Research,” and have been focusing on a number of initiatives to ensure that faculty receive as much support as possible in their attempts to secure external funding. Three such initiatives include:

- Support for faculty in research development, which among other things means strengthening the infrastructure for preparing and negotiating proposals, has been intensified. The aim is both to expand the number of proposals going out and to improve their design in business plans and management structures for accomplishing the work of projects. With a set of changes announced to the faculty in academic year 2010-11, the Office of the Provost carried out the first phase of enhancements along these lines, including hiring a Director of Special Projects to assist faculty in developing large-scale projects and collaborations.
• The Provost’s Investment Fund provides seed grants to faculty for projects that show promise of leading to external funding or expanding enrollments through innovative programming. Initial results confirm that this is a valuable strategy, as seen in new initiatives ranging from the creation of an online Program in Diabetes Education and Management to the development of a curriculum with grant support focusing on economic literacy.

• The College’s multi-year financial plan sets aside investment funding for academic initiatives, and this pool of funds has been used to make investments in programs and projects that show great promise, including high-priority grants that require matching funds, such as the clinically rich teacher education grant seeking state funds in New York under its federal Race to the Top award.

It is highly probable that we are going to see continuing pressure on external funding, but we can manage these challenges if we use our resources wisely and cultivate networks of knowledgeable faculty and staff who are given the tools to be entrepreneurial in an environment characterized simultaneously by substantial downside risk and scarcity along with great upside potential and opportunity for creative new thinking.

Facilities

The physical plant of the College consists of seven academic buildings, which provide 600,000 sq. ft. of useable space allocated across the typical range of uses (classrooms, offices, laboratories, library, conference center, etc.). Approximately 85% of the space is 80 years or older (with more than 50% of the space at least 100 years old). While only 17% of the academic campus has been systematically modernized, with the inclusion of location-specific renovations, approximately 30% of the campus has been modernized.

The College also owns seven residential buildings (524,200 sq. ft.) which accommodate approximately 870 residents. Nearly 80% of the space is 100 years or older, and with the exception of the new residence hall constructed in 2004, none of the older buildings have been systematically modernized.

Over a seven-year period, a total of $110 million in capital spending was authorized (e.g., the renovation of the Library, creation of the Cowin Conference Center, campus-wide roof and window replacements, the construction of the new residence hall) yet despite these strategically important projects, the vast majority of space within the College, and that which is used the most, still requires significant investment.

The residential properties are currently the most in need of work. The possibility of immediate abandonment of any one of the three buildings is low, but we have had and expect to experience future building system failures that will require significant unplanned expenditures to address. If one or more of these residences needed to be taken offline, the College would have insufficient housing stock available, which could impact both budget and reputation.

In response to the pressing need to renovate these buildings, the College has received preliminary approval from the Board of Trustees’ Committee on Business and Finance to
finance a $35 million renovation program. The College has engaged an architectural firm that is in the early stages of a yearlong design process. At the same time, the College has had preliminary discussion with Goldman Sachs regarding financing strategies and schedules. The current timetable is to begin renovation of one of the student residences, Bancroft Hall, in the fall of 2013.

The College will not know until this coming August (after the completion of a preliminary construction cost analysis) whether the $35 million budget will be sufficient to renovate all three buildings.

Of the funding strategies the College is pursuing, the fundraising campaign that the College has outlined includes funding for capital projects as one of three key funding priorities ($100 million). Traditionally, the College has a strong track record of raising funds for scholarships and faculty support, and for capital fundraising but the capital needs are substantially higher than in the past and proportionally larger within the overall campaign goal.

The Campaign for Teachers College

The upcoming campaign to raise $350 million for Teachers College is a tremendous opportunity for the College. The planCreating the Future: The Campaign for Teachers College sets three key investment priorities:

- Scholarships and Fellowships (31%) - to attract top-flight doctoral and masters students by strengthening financial aid ($110 million);
- Faculty and Program Support (40%) - to strengthen our fellowship of scholars by increasing our faculty endowment and establishing the Distinguished Global Scholars Program in Education ($110 million); and to advance innovative faculty-driven research initiative and to provide operational support for groundbreaking research ($30 million); and,
- Capital (29%) - to furnish all of our faculty and students with ultra-smart classrooms, lecture halls, and libraries, all equipped with the latest technology ($100 million).

There are several positive indicators that the College has the capacity to raise the funds needed to invest in student financial aid, faculty retention and recruitment and capital improvements, notwithstanding the recent economic downturn and sluggish recovery. Annual fundraising, for example, has met targeted goals: annual fundraising has grown by 5% annually for three successive years and, since FY2008, the College has had two of the largest fundraising years in its nearly 125-year history ($51.5 million in FY2008 and $36.5 million in FY2009).

Also, in preparation for the upcoming Capital Campaign, the Vice President for Development and External Affairs and her staff have worked to strengthen the development operation and enhance the College’s fundraising potential. Efforts have included a massive database screening of over 60,000 records, the addition of a variety of helpful utilities (including Raiser’s Edge, Apex Reporting, and increased synchronization with the student data system, Banner), greatly enhanced stewardship services (including
over 300 personalized reports sent annually, as compared to 50 several years ago) and alumni affairs activities, and the development of content (including 60 video-recorded interviews) from the oral history project, documenting the College’s history.

Although the College is confident that the campaign will raise anticipated amounts, we remain fiscally conservative in the Five-Year Financial Plan. Each of the three campaign goals will be met much faster with an infusion of needed funds, but the College has instituted needed changes to move the College closer toward its goals, separate from the anticipated campaign funds.

School and Community Partnerships

The Office of School and Community Partnerships was established in 2007 to allow the College to take advantage of the myriad opportunities available to a college of education in the urban heart of New York City. Its mission is to coordinate, deepen and leverage the College’s involvement in NYC public schools to strengthen the quality of teaching, learning and educational outcomes. Its accomplishments since its founding are extensive including:

- Services to Schools - established partnerships with more than 25 schools in Harlem and the Bronx; welcomed over 4,000 school children to visit Teachers College each year for campus tours, graduation ceremonies, theater performances, and learning activities in our classrooms, labs and libraries.
- Fundraising - raised over $10 million to support the College’s work in city schools, which includes operating monies, faculty support and more than 20 graduate assistantships a year.
- Teachers College Partnership Schools - executed a Memorandum of Understanding with the New York City Department of Education to establish the Teachers College Partnership Schools network which will leverage existing and new efforts in Harlem schools and generate research opportunities.
- Streamlined research approval - established a strong relationship with the New York City Department of Education Institutional Review Board resulting in protocols for facilitating and streamlining the approval process for research in New York City schools.
- Zankel Fellowship - administered the Arthur Zankel Fellowship program which allocates $450,000 in “first dollar” awards in departmental financial aid packages for high need full-time students who provide services to urban youth under the mentorship of faculty sponsors.

As a logical and compelling next step in enacting its mission to deepen and leverage the College’s involvement in NYC public schools to strengthen the quality of teaching, learning and educational outcomes, the Office of School and Community Partnerships has had the lead role in the initiative to establish the Teacher’s College Community School (TCCS). The mission of TCCS is to provide a dynamic learning environment that fosters children’s academic, social, emotional and physical development and attends to the important connections among children’s learning, health and family well-being. Approval was recently secured from the New York City Department of Education to
establish TCCS with a projected opening date of September 2011. While this presents an incredible opportunity for the College, one that visibly and demonstrably connects the College more deeply with the local community, it also presents a daunting set of challenges.

Teachers College is investing considerable intellectual, financial and human capital to create a distinctive and successful school that demonstrates the College’s innovative university-Assisted school model. The College has made an excellent choice of a school leader, and has designed the school’s program to include outstanding educational materials and approaches developed at the College. However, since the new school is managed by the New York City Department of Education, the College has limited authority over the school and its program. The challenge is working within the parameters of the New York City Department of Education, as the school could be subject to mandates and fiscal constraints that impact its success.

**International Affairs**

Teachers College has a strong international reputation that generates significant opportunities for engagement globally in education research, training, policy and practice. To capitalize on these opportunities and carry out its historic and current mission as a global force in educational improvement, the College is strategically pursuing a set of institutionally supported international programs. Our institutional strategy for international engagement has four objectives:

- **Uphold Teachers College’s legacy of making an impact.** Our research and our ideas must impact policy and practice in highly constructive ways, influencing how practitioners and scholars are educated while also demonstrating how graduate education can improve the human condition locally, nationally, and globally.

- **Learn from others.** We need to explore and diligently study best practices wherever we can find them. We can learn much through collaborative research, joint activities in teacher preparation and other professional endeavors, and these exchanges are critical to improving our own practice.

- **Engage in activities that help us do our own work better.** Designing, developing and perfecting innovative approaches to professional development abroad will enable us to provide better offerings at our home campus.

- **Generate revenue to support the work of Teachers College.** Diversifying our income and moving away from sole dependence on degree-based tuition revenue are essential to ensuring financial stability.

Illustrative of future opportunities, the College is currently engaged in several international partnerships. These include working with China to facilitate professional development programs for university presidents, deans, school principals and future teachers in China; a partnership with the Queen Rania Teacher Academy in Jordan which is enabling the College to pilot and to refine new approaches to professional development that will benefit many Jordanian teachers and students, while also helping Teachers College to strengthen teacher training and student outcomes all over the world; and, in
India the College is working with two private foundations to attract bright, young Indians to public and private sector careers that focus on improving society and infrastructure.

International work, though, does often create its own unique set of challenges. Collaborating with local partners, for instance, has several benefits but there can also be national and international concerns that may cause a range of problems including issues of politics, reputation and funding. Compliance with applicable foreign laws is always a concern as are compliance issues such as intellectual property, prevailing law and employment contracts. These are primarily tactical or logistical challenges, and with the capacity that has been created in the Office of International Affairs, and with support from other administrative offices they are manageable.

**Relationship with Columbia University**

Teachers College has a unique relationship with Columbia University, unlike that of any other graduate school of education. While affiliated with Columbia University since 1898, Teachers College has retained its fiscal and organizational independence, with a separate and independent Board of Trustees, endowment, and operating budget. While there are manifold opportunities for cross-appointments, and a substantial portion of Teachers College faculty are appointed as Faculty-At-Large to the Columbia University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Teachers College faculty are tenured to the College, not the University. Under terms of the affiliation agreement, while all degrees are formally awarded through Columbia University, the College retains authority for setting the requirements for admission to and completion of all degrees, with the exception of the PhD.

The relationship provides tremendous opportunities for both institutions and their respective students and faculty - the opportunity for intellectual dialogue across and within the University, as well as the shared use of library, recreational, health service facilities, and other resources, contributes significantly to our ability to mount high quality programs of research and instruction, and to attract both highly able and diverse students and faculty to those programs.

One important initiative over the past four years has been the building of stronger communication and cooperation between Teachers College and Columbia University. President Fuhrman opened the door to this highly positive development by inviting the Provosts of Columbia and Teachers College to meet in the summer of 2007. Out of that discussion, a joint task force composed of senior administrators and faculty leaders from both sides of 120th Street was created. Vowing that 120th Street, which separates our campuses, would no longer be known as the “widest street in the world,” the group met regularly to discuss areas of mutual interest and identify steps that could be taken to strengthen working relationships.

Among the topics addressed were administrative collaborations for planning and better resource utilization, improved models for exchange of tuition and dealing with tuition differentials as students take courses across academic units in the university, and shared use of property and facilities where appropriate (e.g., use of classrooms during off hours,
which are early in the day for the College and late in the day for Columbia College, Barnard College and the Graduate School of Arts and Science). Other topics addressed included intellectual collaboration as related to research and teaching; mechanisms for cross-registration of programs; the creation of joint programs, and joint appointments for faculty; sub-matriculation agreements (whereby undergraduates gain access to graduate courses across academic units); and, collaborative grants.

In order to learn more about the intellectual resources available for collaboration, parallel surveys of the faculty at Columbia and Teachers College were conducted focusing on identifying potential shared/common research interests and project collaboration. With the appointment of a new Provost at the University in September 2009, collaborations have continued to foster a strong mutual commitment and a shared vision for working more closely together and aligning areas of interest, especially as related to research, student access to courses needed for their studies, cooperation in developing opportunities for external grant funding, and academic program growth.

Some of the fields in which visible progress has been made in collaboration between Teachers College and Columbia University include neuroscience and cognitive studies (Teagle Foundation grant and use of the FMRI facility at the medical center), sustainable development and conflict resolution (collaboration with the Earth Institute), new directions in medical education, computer science and gaming, Latin American Studies and other regional study groups, educational outreach in local schools (General Electric grant in partnership with the School of Engineering), and joint programming with the Law School and Business Schools to prepare a new generation of public-sector leaders with cross-disciplinary skills.

Although there are emerging university-wide challenges, which are clearly part of the environment that all universities and their respective schools face, centering on such things as rising common costs and benefits expenditures, institutional charges for library services, cost of student health services, and staff access to courses for professional development, the commitment to cooperation remains both a high priority and an immediate objective in the communications between Teachers College and Columbia University for continued collaboration and program development. We believe that collaborations will continue throughout the next several years, not only in identifying opportunities to work together but, more importantly, bringing some of the already developed ideas to fruition.

**Leadership Succession Planning**

Central to any higher education institution’s ability to successfully navigate the challenges and opportunities it faces is the quality and effectiveness of its leadership. Each of our last two self-studies was undertaken in the context of either recent or pending changes in institutional leadership. While that challenge does not frame our current PRR - indeed, much of our PRR documents the success and accomplishment of the President who has led Teachers College since 2006, the leadership team she has assembled, and the successful, effective organizations that each of those leaders have in turn fostered and developed - the issue at play is how to assure a thoughtful and orderly transition to the
next generation of leadership and management. Appropriate leadership succession planning at all levels - from the Board of Trustees, to the President and Senior Staff, to key individuals with functional expertise and knowledge - is important to the continued success of the College.

The College has begun the process of developing a succession plan for the Senior Staff, following the central components identified by Dennis Borden in a June, 2009 article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*:

- Professional development: every institution must identify potential leaders, train them, and supply them with real world experience;
- Leadership transition: protocols must be in place in anticipation of vacancies (whether planned and orderly, or unplanned and urgent); and,
- Once on board: an institution must take steps to ensure that its new staff get off to a positive and productive start, particularly if new to the campus

As a first step in responding to this issue, the Senior Staff will spend a portion of their time at their annual summer retreat discussing the state of play of planning in terms of leadership succession at the College.

While the College has been blessed with consistent Trustee leadership (and may continue to be through the tenure of the current president), the College needs to provide all possible support to the Board in planning for the future. As a first step, conversations will be initiated with the Committee on Trustees, the Board Co-Chairs and the Vice Chair to define a plan for Board leadership development.

Finally, there is a substantial number of individuals at Teachers College who are incredibly important to the functioning of the College. Ensuring that these individuals, who report in to the Senior Staff, are appropriately supported and cultivated, and that the College continues to hire excellent leaders, is essential to assuring the continued success of the College and its operations.

Toward that goal, in the last two years, a new Professional Staff Evaluation Plan (PSEP) was developed. This year, a number of introductory and training sessions were offered to prepare the College’s staff, managers, and leaders to effectively participate in the process of goal setting and performance evaluation. With the experienced senior management and leadership of the College in place, these challenges feel distant rather than immediate. There is however a sense of urgency in the realization that, given the lack of depth in some areas of the College, more effectively planning for and managing possible transitions in targeted areas is a challenge to address over the near term.
Chapter 4 – Enrollment and Finance Trends and Projections

Enrollment Trends and Projections

The enrollment climate at Teachers College can be characterized as robust, healthy and highly diverse. With a total student enrollment of nearly 5,400 students and a 46% growth in applications in the past decade, the demand for graduate study at Teachers College has remained strong. The shape of the student body has shifted significantly and we now enroll more master’s degree students than doctoral, a higher percentage of full-time students and more of our students are coming to Teachers College directly from undergraduate institutions. Although we have seen these shifts in our demographic profile, our selectivity and yield have both increased over the decade. We continue to attract more applicants than we can accommodate, making us a selective graduate institution.

Table 1 below depicts the enrollment trends at the College from 2001 to 2010. There has been a significant and deliberate shift in the composition of the student body. It has been our desire to enroll a smaller cohort of doctoral degree students who are better funded by the institution. The only way to do this, while remaining fiscally and financially sound, was to increase the master’s degree enrollment. Doctoral enrollment has declined by 17% between 2001 and 2010 while master’s enrollment has increased by 31%. Non-degree student enrollment also has declined by 34%. The result is a modest 8% increase in the overall student headcount, but a 17% increase in the points taken by the students. While part-time enrollment has remained relatively stable, full-time enrollment has grown by 29%.

The increase in points taken by students has had a significant impact on the College’s budget as we have roughly $14 million dollars more in gross revenue from tuition than we would have had if enrollment were even with enrollment in 2001.

The enrollment increase has been broad based as each of the College’s nine (to be ten in AY2011-12) departments experienced increases in points taught in department courses over the past decade, and seven of nine departments experienced increases in student major enrollments, with only two departments showing very modest declines. In one instance, Curriculum and Teaching, the overall decline of -8 students (-1.5%) was a consequence of accommodating changes in the New York State certification requirements and the discontinuation of one program stream. Adjusting for the change in programs offered, the department’s overall student major enrollments increased by 66 (14.5%). In the second instance, overall enrollments in the Department of Organization and Leadership also declined by -8 students (-1.0%). In this instance, the contributing factors were the result of planned program design changes (on the one hand, smaller doctoral cohorts in three program areas, and on the other, an increase in point requirements from 32 to 45 for one masters program). Appendix A presents a more detailed look at enrollments within departments from 2000 through 2010. These data provide a more fine-grained look at the diverse array of programs offered at the College, and the importance of that program mix in contributing to the College’s programmatic and financial health.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change 2001-10</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>4,983</td>
<td>5,187</td>
<td>5,087</td>
<td>5,085</td>
<td>5,070</td>
<td>4,963</td>
<td>5,045</td>
<td>5,117</td>
<td>5,388</td>
<td>5,397</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>1,613</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>1,777</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>3,578</td>
<td>3,776</td>
<td>3,629</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>3,503</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>3,467</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>3,582</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>1,765</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>1,715</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>-293</td>
<td>-16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>2,774</td>
<td>2,959</td>
<td>2,932</td>
<td>2,959</td>
<td>3,043</td>
<td>3,021</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>3,234</td>
<td>3,493</td>
<td>3,631</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-degree</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>-150</td>
<td>-33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning</td>
<td>3,741</td>
<td>3,992</td>
<td>3,928</td>
<td>3,863</td>
<td>3,823</td>
<td>3,712</td>
<td>3,732</td>
<td>3,785</td>
<td>3,949</td>
<td>3,945</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's FT</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's PT</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>2,062</td>
<td>2,021</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>1,961</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>1,927</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>2,153</td>
<td>2,243</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral FT</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>-122</td>
<td>-22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral PT</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>-171</td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Points</td>
<td>32,685</td>
<td>34,156</td>
<td>33,621</td>
<td>34,798</td>
<td>35,672</td>
<td>34,684</td>
<td>35,186</td>
<td>35,850</td>
<td>38,541</td>
<td>39,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Points</td>
<td>15,050</td>
<td>15,887</td>
<td>14,682</td>
<td>15,665</td>
<td>15,591</td>
<td>15,966</td>
<td>16,994</td>
<td>16,863</td>
<td>17,597</td>
<td>16,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY Points</td>
<td>79,095</td>
<td>81,600</td>
<td>79,969</td>
<td>82,903</td>
<td>84,026</td>
<td>82,580</td>
<td>84,670</td>
<td>85,224</td>
<td>91,282</td>
<td>92,763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Summer is projected based on budget goal
The only current programs with significant enrollment declines (Giftedness, Hearing Impairment, Reading Specialist and Instructional Technology) reflect changes in certification requirements. Declines also came from the planned elimination of programs in Dance Education, Religion and Education, Learning Disabilities, and Teaching of Spanish.

Although the mix of students by degree and full-time/part-time status has changed significantly in the past decade, the student population remains extremely diverse (see Appendix B). Over 15% of students are from outside of the United States and over 32% have self-identified as being from federally recognized ethnic and minority groups. Asian-Americans account for 11% of enrollment, African-Americans 9% and Latino students 9%. The percentage of enrollment consisting of white U.S. citizens has declined from 57% in 2000 to 52% in 2010.

One aspect of the student demographics that has changed is the typical age of the students. In 2010 the median age of students is 29 and 30% are 25 or under. In 2000 the median age was 31 and only 18% of students were 25 or younger. As a result the Admissions Office and other student services office have needed to reframe their services to accommodate a younger group of students.

Table 2 below illustrates the significant application growth at Teachers College from 2000-10. During this time, the College has experienced a 46% increase in applications, from just over 4,000 applications to over 6,000. There was also a concurrent 18% increase in admitted students and a 47% increase in new students. The vast majority of the increase in applications was for master’s degree programs as doctoral applications have remained relatively flat.

**Table 2**

| Applications, Admissions and New Enrolled Summer/Fall 2000 to 2010 |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                          | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| Applications             | 4,183 | 4,123 | 4,537 | 4,776 | 4,753 | 5,256 | 5,028 | 5,285 | 5,429 | 5,946 | 6,097 |
| New Enrolled            | 1,257 | 1,296 | 1,404 | 1,332 | 1,348 | 1,205 | 1,418 | 1,552 | 1,544 | 1,818 | 1,843 |
The increase in applications has enabled the College to be more selective in admitting students, as Table 3 illustrates. In 2010, 59% of the entire applicant pool was granted admission, including doctoral applicants who were denied admission to doctoral programs but offered admission to a master’s program instead. By way of comparison, in 2000, 73% of the applicants were granted admission. The yield rate (percentage of admitted students who enroll) rose to a high of 51% in 2010, up from a low of 40% in 2005. The increase in yield in the past 5 years can be attributed to a much more vigorous outreach and communications program with prospective students as well as to a more strategic use of financial aid resources with students who would otherwise have been unlikely to enroll.

Table 3

For the 2011 application cycle, we are currently tracking at 7% ahead of last year’s application counts at the same point in time in the process. As of May 9, 2011, the College has received 6236 applications compared to 5818 at the same point in time last year. Roughly half of the increase in applications is due to odd year cohort programs that did not admit last year, so the true increase so far this year is about 3.5%. We are, however, starting to notice declining applications for some of our larger programs, including the Teaching of English, the master’s programs in Clinical and Counseling Psychology, and the Elementary Inclusive Education program that we will need to keep a close eye on moving forward.

While the enrollment and application trends at the College over the past 5 years have been very strong, we are conservatively projecting enrollment for the next 4 years as part
of the College’s financial plan. The operating assumption in the financial plan is that 70% of the large growth in FY2010 would be maintained in FY2011, and that enrollment would grow by 1% in each of the three following years before leveling off in FY2015. With FY2011 almost complete, we are projecting that current year enrollment will be over 3,000 points above the initial budget projection. Enrollment for AY2011 is strong, but there is good reason for the College to be conservative and cautious about enrollment over the next few years. The economic recession has led to a decline in demand for teachers, and New York City in particular is facing the likelihood of teacher cuts. Further, we are experiencing application reductions in some of our largest programs, particularly in secondary teacher education. We are also facing student funding reductions from external sources including Math for America and our U.S. Department of Education funded Teaching Residents program. Although we have new programs in other areas such as the Diabetes Management and Education Masters Program and the Executive Masters Program in Organizational Psychology, overall enrollment is not expected to grow at the rate it has over the past 5 years. See Table 4 below.

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment History and Projections AY 2007-08 to AY 2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Headcount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,045            5,117         5,388         5,397         5,220         5,272         5,325         5,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY Points                                  84,670          85,224         91,282         92,763         89,708         90,605         91,511         91,511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\emph{FY 2011 AY Points are projected}

### Finance Trends and Projections

Despite the turbulent economic times in recent years, the College has consistently reported internal operating surpluses. These surpluses can be attributed to both strong enrollment and expense control. These factors are evidenced by Teachers College recording approximately 5,800 more points than budgeted in fiscal year 2010 and a decrease in overall expenses of $1.5 million from fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2010. The College does not record depreciation or items categorized as non-operating in these operating results. These items, which have been largely influenced by the recession in the overall United States economy, drove a decrease in net assets from 2007 through 2009. However, this trend was reversed in 2010 as the College recorded an increase in net assets of $4.4 million.

The College’s investments are its largest asset. The endowment returned 7.6% in fiscal year 2010 after recording losses of 7.3% and 2.3% in fiscal years 2009 and 2008 respectively. While the economic downturn hit us hard, the endowment performance was slightly better than the national average in 2008 (-2.7%) and considerably better in 2009 (-18.7%). As of December 31, 2010, the College’s endowment is back over $200 million for the first time since August 2008. There is also strong liquidity within the portfolio. Total investments (endowment and short term funds) and cash totaled $218 million at August 31, 2010. Of this amount, $110 million or just over 50% provides same day liquidity while an additional $19 million or 9% provide monthly liquidity. This liquidity provides the opportunity to move nimbly into new investment opportunities and ensures a steady flow of cash into the operations of the College.
The College has been proactive in addressing its long-term liabilities. In FY2010, there were significant changes to the College’s post-retirement health plan whereby eligible employees (faculty and professional staff hired before January 1, 2006) contribute to the plan based on age and years of service. Prior to this change, there were no retiree contributions. The plan was also amended to exclude spouses.

In April 2010 and February 2011, using operating surpluses, the College paid a total of $7.5 million to terminate a $43.5 million notional amount of a floating-to-fixed-interest rate swap agreement that was no longer required as a hedge on its Series 2007 bonds. This termination eliminated a liability that stood at $9.6 million and $7.4 million at August 31, 2009 and 2010, respectively. It also eliminated ongoing annual carrying costs which were $2.1 million and $1.9 million in FY2009 and FY2010 respectively.

See the following table for financial highlights over the last five fiscal years.

<p>| Table 5 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(S’s in million)</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Sheet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>$365.0</td>
<td>$364.2</td>
<td>$395.0</td>
<td>$407.0</td>
<td>$372.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities</td>
<td>193.4</td>
<td>197.1</td>
<td>$175.0</td>
<td>$163.1</td>
<td>137.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets</td>
<td>171.5</td>
<td>167.1</td>
<td>220.0</td>
<td>243.9</td>
<td>234.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Endowment</td>
<td>$183.3</td>
<td>$181.3</td>
<td>$209.2</td>
<td>$219.8</td>
<td>$188.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>(7.3%)</td>
<td>(2.3%)</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Cash and Investments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Balances</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$31.2</td>
<td>$30.4</td>
<td>$30.5</td>
<td>$22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Plant and Equipment</td>
<td>$119.2</td>
<td>$122.7</td>
<td>$123.7</td>
<td>$124.3</td>
<td>$125.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding Principal</td>
<td>$86.2</td>
<td>$87.7</td>
<td>$82.0</td>
<td>$84.4</td>
<td>$80.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5 - Assessment Processes and Use of Results

Culture of Assessment

Since our last Middle States self-study, and with the arrival of President Fuhrman, a culture of assessment has begun to emerge and has steadily grown at the College. Early in her presidency, the President undertook external reviews of the major administrative areas (2006-07) to determine whether or not the College as a whole, and discretely within various areas, was structured in the most effective as well as mission-compatible and mission-supportive fashion. The reviewers evaluated efficiency and effectiveness of existing structures and level of allocated resources. They also benchmarked the administrative areas with respect to similar institutions.

The President’s commitment to data-driven planning and decision-making, as evidenced in these early reviews, signaled a clear direction to the new leadership team and to the College community. The new Provost and two Vice Presidents continued building a culture of assessment across the College: using the findings and recommendations of the external reviewers as the basis for planning and decision-making, they undertook in-depth studies of specific administrative units and functions within their respective areas.

Shortly after his arrival, Provost Thomas James continued a critical assessment of the academic areas of the College. This included formal evaluation and self-studies focused on academic departments and programs and on Teachers College centers and institutes. Each study aimed at yielding the most relevant analysis for addressing institutional needs, and this aim in turn was viewed in the context of addressing critically important challenges that face our society both locally and nationally.

- The academic self-study process (2007-09), both collaborative and collegial in its application to the academic structure of the College, was based on (a) institutionally verifiable registration, admissions, and demographic data and (b) data self-reported at the program-level, compiled at the departmental level and reviewed across all areas of the College. The findings most relevant to all areas under study have been and continue to be addressed by the Office of the Provost. For example, an overall need “to clear the underbrush” or provide more efficient administrative support was handled through a business process review of the relevant areas (e.g., Office of Sponsored Programs). Most importantly, new and innovative programming possibilities came to light and have been expanded and evaluated as a result of the self-study findings. The identified high-priority areas of study have taken different trajectories in subsequent program development and have been integrated into the culture of assessment as they have become new programs (the Executive Masters Program in Organizational Psychology and the Diabetes Education and Management Program) and departments (Department of Education Policy and Social Analysis), faculty work groups, and incorporated into alternative learning formats.

- In the summer of 2009, the College undertook a review of its centers and institutes with a general goal to enhance quality and performance. The study began with comprehensive data collection, including surveys and in-person
interviews. This material was reviewed by an internal advisory committee, by faculty at large, and by a visiting team of directors of centers and institutes at other major research universities. The review identified a need for clearly codified policies and procedures relating to the starting, ending, reporting and governance of centers, institutes and special projects similar to centers. In the fall of 2010, Teachers College officially implemented the new policy, which also clearly lays out a plan for annual review and periodic in-depth review of all centers and institutes over their lifespan.

These two major self-studies completed by the Office of the Provost were critical in laying the groundwork for some of the most innovative research and practice at the College. The self-studies were also critically important in ensuring that research and practice fall clearly within the framework of the College’s academic mission, locating oversight centrally while enabling intellectual activity, sparking innovation, and encouraging growth of productivity in all parts of the academic structure.

As the newly appointed Vice President for Development and External Affairs, Suzanne Murphy utilized the recommendations of the external reviewers to restructure and reorganize the department and to commission comprehensive reviews of Advancement Services and Donor Relations to ensure that staffing needs were adequately met in these areas, and that appropriate policies and procedures were designed and implemented. The reviews, completed by experienced professionals from other organizations, provided clear roadmaps for best practices for the staff underscoring the need for a new database system as the main infrastructure tying all operations together. In August 2008, after an extensive selection process, Vice President Murphy selected the Raiser’s Edge database from Blackbaud.

In response to the reviewers recommendations for the Finance and Administration area, new Vice President for Finance and Administration, Harvey Spector worked on making the College’s budget process more transparent and a five year financial planning process was instituted wherein the annual budget was discussed in the context of a forward looking view of the College’s longer-term financial outlook and those known or assumed trends and issues that were expected to have an influence on the College’s finances. The financial plan has been fully integrated into the College’s budget process. In addition, Vice President Spector instituted a year-long process to review and rewrite all personnel policies by the Office of Human Resources to reflect best practice approaches and legal mandates and reorganized the Office of Facilities to address deficiencies in management and service delivery. Specific service protocols are being established and new information systems are being developed to track repair requests and service response times.

While the highlighted self-studies and reviews were for the express purpose of crucial and reflective assessment, there are many additional types of careful data collection and distribution that are routinely collected, addressing the challenges and demands of operating in a dynamic and ever-changing global environment. An extensive survey program, developed and implemented by the College since 2006, is aimed at listening to
the voice of our students, graduates, and other stakeholders and at improving quality and developing new services and products.

Developing a culture of assessment is about learning how to learn. Teachers College, with direction and guidance from its senior leadership, has embarked on this journey of cultural transformation by establishing planning and decision-making processes that both foster and depend on an environment of assessment. Starting with self-studies as the foundation for planning and institutional renewal, building the culture of assessment, in which institutional and individual reflection and action are supported by data, the College entered the new 2010-2015 period with clearly articulated priorities, carefully developed strategies to achieve these priorities and commitment to continually monitor and assess its progress towards strategic goals.

**Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness**

The *Institutional Plan for the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness* (Appendix E) is grounded in Teachers College’s historical mission and organized around six primary institutional goals:

1. Engage in research on central issues facing education broadly defined
2. Educate the current and next generation of leaders in education practice and policy
3. Increase Teachers College’s impact - locally, nationally, and internationally
4. Develop a diverse community with shared mission
5. Ensure long-term viability of the College
6. Assure highest quality of service to the College community

Each primary goal is further broken down into subsidiary goals which were derived through an iterative and collaborative process of institutional planning. The primary and subsidiary goals along with unit goals and strategies to accomplish these goals establish the framework for the *Institutional Plan for the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness*.

In addition to the primary and subsidiary goals, the process utilizes the Assessment Plan Template, a standard reporting matrix used across all administrative and support areas, to identify realistic strategies, expected outcomes, progress and performance measures, timelines, and individuals responsible for implementation of strategies and assessment activities. Each non-academic unit annually completes the template, documents the achievement to date, and updates the template as needed. The use of common templates for the assessment of progress and performance reduces fragmentation and presents a cohesive framework for the institutional assessment activities.

The *Institutional Plan for the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness* includes examples of the assessment plans from individual administrative units. Below we highlight several planning and assessment activities particularly relevant to the site visit team’s recommendations and suggestions in response to our 2005-06 self-study.
Enrollment Planning and Management (Standard 2)

In an effort to investigate potential changes in the size of the College and the mix of enrolled students, in 2005 the College created the Comprehensive Modeling Committee, chaired by the Director of Institutional Studies and including the Director of Enrollment Services, a member of the Board of Trustees and four faculty members. The group met through the 2006-07 academic year and modeled the feasibility, including the potential financial impact of changes to the masters/doctoral and full-time/part-time student mix, the number and type of faculty, the amount of financial aid and several other variables. The results of the modeling exercise led to the conclusion that growth in enrollment at the masters degree level coupled with a decline in doctoral enrollment could both increase the amount of financial aid available to doctoral students and grow net revenue while keeping the overall size of the College in balance with instructional resources and capacity. This conclusion set a strategic direction for enrollment at the College and guided enrollment planning discussions in the subsequent years. The College has been largely successful in creating a more balanced mix between masters and doctoral and full- and part-time enrollments as well as resourcing program areas where enrollment growth at the masters degree level exceeded program capacity.

Subsequently, in implementing this strategic shift in the composition of enrollments at the College, enrollment management has annually focused on three distinct strategies to strengthen masters level enrollment: increasing applications, improving yield, and improving the goal setting process with each of the academic departments and programs.

First, the Admissions and Marketing offices have expanded our outreach initiatives with the goal of increasing the pool of applicants at the masters level, enabling academic programs to maintain or improve selectivity while growing enrollment in targeted ways. Staff members in the Office of Admission participate in graduate recruitment fairs at key colleges and universities throughout the United States, visit all of our top feeder schools, and host information sessions each year in our primary (New York, Boston, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Washington) and secondary (Chicago, Atlanta, Philadelphia) markets. Recruitment strategies have been tailored to younger students, primarily by a greater electronic presence including targeted online marketing.

Yield rates have also improved, from 40% in 2005 to 51% in 2010. The Admissions Office has implemented a more comprehensive communications plan with admitted students, providing them with personalized messages, follow up, and continual, but targeted, communication. The annual Admitted Student Weekend has been expanded, as faculty, staff and current students are involved in helping to welcome our admitted students to campus. Academic programs have made financial aid decisions earlier, putting aid in play when it can have the most impact on a student’s decision to enroll. Centrally awarded financial aid has been used to leverage enrollment from masters degree applicants by targeting prospective students who would have otherwise been unlikely to enroll.

Department and program enrollment goals are set annually in the fall through iterative planning discussions with Department Chairs and the goal setting process is informed by
an analysis of program by program enrollment in the department, including continuing
and new students, and then use this data, in consultation with program faculty and with
knowledge of staffing and other changes within the department, to set goals for the
coming year. Relevant market analyses also inform the process and when trends suggest
opportunities for enrollment growth, the process also identifies resource needs to support
planned or targeted enrollment growth strategies.

Once the goals are set, application and admission patterns are monitored for each
program on a weekly basis throughout the spring term, as are financial aid award reports.
Appropriate actions are taken in conjunction with departments and programs depending
on the data, and may include marketing initiatives to generate applications, creating
waiting lists of prospective students to guard against decreased yield, and targeting
financial aid to improve yield.

A challenge of the shift to a larger masters level enrollment base is the need for
enrollment management to view enrollment in a multi-year context that enables us to
guard against changes in the market. We need to be aware of where the market is shifting
in ways that might lead to a decrease in demand and enrollment in some areas but an
opportunity to respond to emerging demand in others. One particular challenge is the way
that the economic recession has led to a decline in demand for teachers, with New York
City and other urban school districts that have traditionally hired our graduates facing the
likelihood of deep teacher cuts. This may have a future impact on demand for our teacher
education master degree programs. Encouraging opportunities to develop new programs
that match well with our capacity can add to the breadth of our offerings and provide a
hedge against potential downturns in demand in other areas. To this end, in the past
couple of years the College has made investments in developing and implementing new
programs in Diabetes Education and Management (fall, 2011) and the Executive Masters
Program in Organizational Psychology (spring 2011). The College is continuing to
investigate other possible programs that might match well with our expertise and
capacity.

Multi-Year Budget: Institutional Resources to Support Innovations (Standard 3)

Much of the work during the first year of the new administration sought to more directly
link budgeting and financial planning to support academic programs of research,
instruction, and service. Beginning with the FY2007-08 budget, major changes were
implemented in both the process used for developing the budget and in establishing
priorities for the allocation of resources to support College activities. These changes were
developed by the President with early and significant collaboration with the trustees,
faculty leadership and staff. The changes were designed to achieve a number of important
objectives: better transparency in budget development, closer collaboration between
academic and administrative parts of the College, less centralization and more authority
to the academic departments, and close alignment with the strategic goals to provide
increased resources to the academic activities of the College and to achieve
administrative savings through increased efficiencies in support operations.

The Five-Year Financial Plan for the period FY 2012-16 (included along with this report)
reflects a comprehensive inventory of unrestricted revenue and expenses based upon assumptions that are strongly linked to achievable academic and financial strategies. Evaluating the impacts of these strategies strengthens the relationship between academic and financial planning with the academic plan informing the budget rather than the budget constraining the potential of academic programs and services. By establishing a financial framework over a long-term horizon, the Plan enhances the College’s ability to set priorities among competing needs and make more informed allocation decisions within this framework. It also provides early recognition of possible disruptive revenue or expense trends that may be minimized by early remedial interventions. Revisions to the Plan on an annual basis assure that risks, challenges, and strategies are recognized and communicated to institutional decision makers in a timely manner in an environment that promotes consensus building and decisiveness. This kind of self-examination and reassessment is key to the successful integration of academic goals and objectives within a responsive and responsible financial framework.

Initiated in FY2011, the operating budget allocates $1.5 million to support both new academic endeavors and existing programs that have experienced significant enrollment growth.

**Key Improvements to Information Systems (Standard 3, 8, and 9)**

One set of suggestions made by the site visit team focused attention on the need to improve information systems that support the administrative management of the institution to facilitate the work of students, faculty and staff (standard 3); improve the underlying work processes supporting application review and admission decisions (standard 8); and make additional investment in technology to improve enrollment services processes including course scheduling, registration, internal communication, advising, etc. (Standard 9).

Below is a brief sketch of some of the work we have done in leveraging information technology to increase productivity and efficiency in our work across these areas. Specifically, we have introduced new technologies in the Offices of Admission and Financial Aid that have expedited processes and workflows to help staff members to respond and communicate with students in a more comprehensive and robust manner.

In the Office of Admission, we have enhanced the Admitted Student Website so that our admitted students receive unique and personalized information specific to their programs of study. We are able to add information to the site at strategic times throughout the cycle, so that admitted students remain in contact with us and move closer toward successful enrollment. The personalized URL allows us to track and review online behavior of our admitted students so that we can better predict enrollment numbers and projections based on the actions that students are taking. The system also allows us to add content including welcome letters, online videos, and other information. The Office of Admission is set up to receive electronic scores from ETS for GRE and TOEFL. The Office receives electronic transcripts and international credential evaluations from the World Evaluation Services (WES) which expedites application processing for international applicants. The document imaging system (NOLIJ) implemented by the
Office of Admission allows us to move away from a paper-based filing system to an electronic and more interactive filing system. Academic departments and programs were trained to do online reviews of applicants.

The Office of Financial Aid introduced an online financial aid management system (APEX) that is used by department administrators. It is accessed through the TC Portal and allows academic departments and staff in the Office of Financial Aid to better track awards to new and continuing students. Moreover, the online application for TC Financial Aid/Scholarship is required for any applicant to receive institutional funding from the College. This new APEX system has reconciled reporting on endowed and restricted funds, and coordination of administrative offices surrounding the awarding of Financial Aid from these funds, resulting in management and functional reporting tools for CIS, Financial Aid, Development and External Affairs, department administrators, and budget to better administer, manage, and steward all scholarship and financial aid accounts at the College.

Other Enrollment and Student Services offices also implemented important technologically mediated work processes and service improvements:

- The Registrar’s Office, in addition to digitalizing more than 30,000 records of students enrolled prior to 2003, implemented online processes for final grade submissions and room assignments, both of which improved timeliness and effectiveness of services.
- The Office of Career Services improved the efficiency and effectiveness of services by switching to a more comprehensive online job, career event and mentor database, moving it into the College’s TC Portal to provide single student and alumni sign-on, and creating webinars to increase access for students and alumni to career development.
- The Office of Insurance and Immunizations improved service delivery to students by implementing added Efax functionality for immunization documentation and creating an online system streamlining management and compliance requests related to NYS student health regulations.
- The Office of International Student Services developed a pre-arrival online video, which improves services and communication with incoming and continuing students, and is completing work on an online version of the international student employment workshop which is mandatory.

With the Director of the TC Web in a lead role, the College has contracted with a content management system provider who has had experience working with higher education institutions with similar technical infrastructures, to implement a new Content Management System (CMS). Though ultimately providing substantial efficiency and effectiveness gains across several academic and non-academic offices, the first priority is the Teachers College Catalog. An interdepartmental effort is currently underway to utilize the new CMS to completely re-engineer the processes that go into the development and revision of the Catalog. The Catalog's content includes degree descriptions and requirements, course descriptions and related instructors, instructor biographical information, and College policy information, and serves as an informational
backbone for the College. The goal of this project is to develop through strategic linking of technical resources, a clear method for administrative and academic units to manage, input and edit information, submit it to an approval process, and ultimately disseminate information to end users via the College’s public website, private intranet site, print publications, targeted emails, electronic displays and other new and emerging distribution platforms.

The Office of Computing and Information Systems has implemented a new College portal, MyTC, which provides a unified, single sign-on environment for students and faculty to see and enter courses via the new TC Apps online teaching and learning platform, retrieve course content, communicate with each other, register for classes, view grades/transcripts, see departmental news, and browse the pocket knowledge library repository for useful educational materials. MyTC portal also provides access to internal websites and to transactions related to registration, financial aid, human resources, and payroll behind a single sign-on.

CIS migrated the College to Google Apps for Education bringing faculty, staff and students into a common email system for the first time, and providing a wealth of collaborative tools such as Google docs and chat. CIS also created a new TC Message Center within MyTC to facilitate community communication, provided video- and web-based conferencing support for classes as well as other academic and administrative use, and upgraded the cable TV to a digital satellite system.

Performance Evaluation and Professional Development (Standard 5)

During our last self-study the College made a recommendation, and the visiting team concurred, that the College needs to create a consistent and uniformed performance review process throughout the institution which will, among other functions, guide our efforts to expand professional development opportunities.

Following this recommendation, the College began its work on the Professional Staff Evaluation Plan (PSEP) to strengthen the performance evaluation process at the College. In spring 2010, the broad-based College-wide Professional Staff Review Committee was created to review the existing performance evaluation system and make recommendations for improvements. Sibson Consulting was hired to assist in the process. The Committee’s goals included the following:

- Enhance the performance review process
  - Establish a consistent College-wide review process to ultimately integrate with merit-pay
  - Develop and implement the review transparently by incorporating input from professional staff/Management Network and appropriate faculty
  - Develop a rating scale with clear definitions
  - Facilitate review of process implementation across the College
  - Establish timeline for all key activities, including fall goal setting
- Engage managers and employees
  - Implement with full participation by all professional staff
- Provide training to ensure understanding
- Support professional development
  - Facilitate professional staff development by enabling growth within and across positions
  - Assist units in developing and improving performance, improving service to the College, enhancing team pride and supporting professional development

In the fall of 2010, ten mandatory training and orientation seminars supporting the Professional Staff Performance Review process were conducted for the senior staff, 443 full-time professionals, 105 supervisors, and 26 faculty supervisors (including 10 department chairs and center/institute directors). Emphasized were the Professional Staff Performance Review’s purpose, value to TC, goal-setting skills required for a successful review process and the new review form.

Over the fall and spring semesters, the supervisors and employees held one-on-one meetings to set employees’ individual goals consistent with the goals of the respective units and the College at large. Nine more education sessions about the appraisal skills were held in spring to assist supervisors and employees in the process.

The online system for the submission of the Professional Staff Performance Review forms is fully operational and all forms are due July 31, 2011. The results of the first round of performance evaluation will be reviewed by the Office of Human Resources with the goal of making recommendations for possible improvements designing professional development opportunities for the professional staff that will benefit the individuals and the respective units the most.

Diversity Action Plan (Standard 4)

Early in 2009, responding to concerns by faculty and other members of the Teachers College community that insufficient progress was being made to improve the campus climate and other aspects of the College around issues of race, culture, and diversity, Teachers College formed a faculty-driven Task Force on Diversity and Anti-Discrimination. Reflecting the faculty’s desire to play a leadership role in helping Teachers College make progress in this important arena, the task force operates under the auspices of the Faculty Executive Committee’s Committee on Race, Culture and Diversity. Both the President and the Provost participate actively. The work of the task force is focused on developing a comprehensive and sustainable plan for Teachers College to strengthen anti-discrimination and diversity initiatives so that they become integral to our academic structure and are fully present in shaping the life of the College in the future.

Essential elements in the Diversity Action Plan include a declaration of purpose that leaves no doubt about the commitment of the institution, clear goals and standards for what is to be accomplished, careful review of policies and procedures as a basis for envisioning potential lines of improvement, longitudinal evaluation benchmarked against goals, and institutionalizing purposeful strategies of change to enhance diversity. The
Plan reiterates and reaffirms the diversity mission statement formally approved for Teachers College in 1999-2000:

To establish Teachers College as 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 his or her full potential.

With that commitment as background, key strands in the task force’s deliberations include comparing best practices across higher education, engaging department chairs and other leaders in identifying concrete steps that can be taken within departments and programs, gathering historical and current documents related to diversity concerns at the College, conducting an in-depth climate study that can lay the groundwork for longitudinal assessment, summarizing and analyzing procedures used for diversity issues as they arise in the College, improving recruitment and retention processes especially for faculty searches, strategizing to build an awareness-raising campaign within Teachers College, creating optimal working relationships between the Office of Diversity and Community and all elements of the Teachers College community, and - encompassing all these other strands - the development of the institutional plan, that will make the actions taken sustainable over time for the benefit of all who are part of the College.

Evaluation is an institutional goal under this action plan, but it is also more than that. If established successfully as a community norm and incorporated authentically into the life of the College, sound evaluation is an instrument for building understanding and cooperation around fully recognizing what needs to be done to improve the lived experience of diversity in the College. Evaluations are important not only for showing progress or the lack of it, but for creating a feedback loop of community perceptions that can form the basis for continuous improvement over time.

The first step in evaluation has already been taken with the support of two senior faculty members with the expertise in multiculturalism and diversity issues by the Office of the Provost to design and carry out a first stage of the diversity climate study over three years. The objective is to develop and pilot a multi-dimensional approach to investigate the climate for diversity through a multiyear, mixed-methods study structured to culminate in the design of a survey instrument to assess institutional diversity climate which would be administered annually.

**Compliance Review Program**

Teachers College has developed a framework for its institutional compliance program designed to satisfy the legally recognized elements of an effective compliance program: (1) standards and procedures to prevent and deter violations of law; (2) overall responsibility assigned to personnel with appropriate resources and authority with the governing body knowledgeable about the program and exercising reasonable oversight and those with operational authority for the program having authority for personal communications to the governing body; (3) personnel with substantial authority for the program of high integrity and chosen with due diligence; (4) effective training programs
and dissemination of information; (5) monitoring of compliance activities, reporting mechanisms for concerns of unlawful conduct, and effective follow up and investigation of reports; (6) consistent enforcement of standards through incentive and discipline; (7) appropriate responses to violations of law, including modifications to the compliance program as needed.

The Compliance Committee which consists of the senior staff other than the President, develops the overall compliance plan, including a multi-year schedule for reviewing each major area of compliance at least once every three years, and makes reports to the President and the Board of Trustees’ Audit Committee regarding the College’s compliance program. The Compliance Matrix is designed to provide for coordination and documentation of existing and ongoing compliance initiatives to meet increased federal regulations, external standards, and “best practices.”

**Assessment of Student Learning**

Teachers College is committed to ensuring that all students, regardless of their chosen program, receive systematic instruction and demonstrate achievement in the five competency areas (CAs):

- **Professional practice**: Demonstrate mastery of the content and methodologies of their discipline or profession.
- **Research, scholarship, and inquiry**: Use skills of inquiry, research, critical thinking, and problem solving to pursue and evaluate knowledge.
- **Professionalism, lifelong learning, and professional development**: Engage in professional discourse and take responsibility for one’s personal and professional growth.
- **Communication, collaboration, and leadership**: Demonstrate effective communication, collaboration and leadership skills to convert goals and commitments into action.
- **Diversity, multiculturalism, advocacy, and social justice**: Appreciate, understand nature and causes of injustice, and take actions to promote a better world.

While the competency areas are shared across the College, differences in program missions and emphases and in students served necessitate differences in how academic programs approach the assessment process.

Individual program goals and outcomes are clearly tied to the College’s mission and the expectations for student learning. Each academic degree program has mapped the five competency areas to program-level goals and outcomes, and, in turn, to core course objectives within the programs. Program-level objectives are informed not only by the College’s learning goals and the mission of each program but also, in many cases, by external standards either mandated or recommended by specialty professional associations. To the extent that they have been aligned with the five competency areas, program-level outcomes provide a means by which the diverse range of assessment activities undertaken at the program and course level can be analyzed and summarized in
College-wide internal and external reports.

The *Institutional Plan for the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes* (Appendix F) is a compilation of individual program assessment plans unified by the above competency areas and common templates which are flexible enough to allow individual academic programs to conduct assessments according to the needs of their students, to the specifics of their disciplines of professional fields, and to the changing contexts.

Faculty in academic programs have primary responsibility for determining the goals and outcomes of their programs, selecting appropriate assessment measures and methods, collecting, analyzing, and reflecting on the data, and implementing plans for improvement based on the assessment findings. Program coordinators are responsible for annually reviewing and updating the Program Assessment Plans based on the prior year assessments results.

The emphasis of the College-wide process is not on merely collecting volumes of assessment data but rather on encouraging self-reflective practices and building a culture of evidence, in which collected data serve as a foundation for improvement of teaching and learning within the programs and around the College. The review of the Program Assessment Plans show that program faculty constantly reflect on their effectiveness in achieving the intended outcomes and make improvements to the programs based on the assessment findings. As indicated in the Program Assessment Plans:

- Many program faculty members integrated new teaching strategies, new technologies or new classroom management processes into their courses. Feedback from students led several programs to re-evaluate the course structure and content and to eliminate significant overlap between in-program courses and to re-evaluate the sequence of coursework.
- With internships and student teaching playing a central role in many of the College's programs, feedback from both internship/student teaching supervisors and the students was used to improve the experience for all parties. For example, feedback from students on the quality of their supervision, value of the experience, and applicability to a future career was used to determine whether or not a program will continue to place students at certain sites. Additionally, feedback from supervisors helped some program faculty to see where students may need additional preparation prior to entering the professional field.
- A number of programs began to incorporate supplemental experiences, such as professional development lecture series, networking and alumni events, and student attendance and presentation at professional national and international conferences in an effort to encourage a learning experience that extends beyond the classroom.
- Finally, in response to graduating students' interest in a strong alumni network, many programs developed methods for keeping in touch with alumni and maintaining tight networks, including regular newsletters, email communication, and alumni events.
We believe that our College-wide assessment process, which is respectful of programmatic differences and faculty ownership of the assessment process and which is focused on enhancing the quality of education rather than on compliance, is the most conducive for the cultural change we strive to nurture. We expect that by the end of the current planning period (2011-16) Teachers College will have sufficient institutional level evidence of student performance on all five competency areas.
Chapter 6 – Linked Institutional Planning and Budgeting Processes

The Five-Year Financial Plan (“the Plan”) for the period FY 2011-15 is a study of the sources and uses of funding by major categories of revenues and expenses. It is a fluid document subject to modification as the College adjusts to changes in the academic and financial marketplaces, emergencies and unforeseen opportunities. The first year of the financial plan (FY2011) reflects the proposed annual operating budget for the period September 1, 2010 to August 31, 2011. The broad categories of revenues and expenses depicted in the Five-Year Plan are allocated according to functional categories in the presentation of the annual operating budget. These functional categories of revenues and expenses are consistent with the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) reporting guidelines and the financial statement formatting requirements of the Financial Accounting Standards Board’s (FASB) Accounting Standard No. 117. The annual operating budget is an “all funds” budget that depicts unrestricted and restricted sources and uses of funding.

The Plan reflects a comprehensive inventorying of unrestricted revenue and expenses based upon assumptions that are strongly linked to achievable academic and financial strategies. The strengthening of the relationship between academic and financial planning results in the academic plan informing the budget in contrast to the budget constraining the potential of academic programs and services. The Plan enhances the College’s ability to set priorities among competing needs and make more informed allocation decisions. It also provides early recognition of possible disruptive revenue or expense trends that may be minimized by early remedial interventions. The effective dissemination of the Plan will assure that risks, challenges, and strategies are broadly communicated to promote consensus building and provide fundamental information for institutional decision makers. This kind of scrutiny and self-examination over an extended timeframe enhance the process by which academic goals and objectives are successfully integrated within a responsive and responsible financial framework.

The Plan includes strategies that were influenced by the following external factors:

- The extent to which the economic recession would impact enrollment and alter future financial projections.
- The extent to which the unprecedented stock market decline would continue to erode the value of the endowment. This had immediate and long-term effects in reducing the support of operations. Also, many endowed accounts became “underwater” and could not be applied toward operating budget support.
- Similarly, poor stock market performance reduced the asset value of the non-academic employee defined benefit plan resulting in future budgetary pressure to fund the plan at levels required to meet future pension liabilities and comply with the Pension Protection Act of 2006.
- The extremely low short-term interest rate environment increased the monthly transactional costs of the College’s swap agreement while low long-term interest rates made the termination of the swap too costly.

The following strategies were integrated into the plan to respond to the challenges noted...
above and to assure future financial stability:

- **Enrollment**
  - Sustain 70% (3,600 points) of the FY2010 enrollment gain through FY2015
  - Selectively grow enrollment 1% annually in FY’s 2012, 13 and 14

- **Non-Credit Revenue**
  - Sustain current academic department generated revenue yield
  - Re-build core support function under the academic umbrella
  - Assume modest non-credit net income growth in both domestic and international programs

- **Fundraising**
  - Target an average of $1.3 million annually (FY2011 – 15) in new unrestricted revenue from the capital campaign to support academic initiatives

- **Cost Containment**
  - Assume continued savings in overtime and procurement activities
  - Assume higher employee contribution to partially offset increased health insurance premium costs

- **Tuition Rate**
  - Raise tuition by 4.5% annually (FY2011 – 15)

- **Energy Conservation and Staffing Review**
  - Planning for energy analysis/audit has been initiated
  - Office support analysis will start in FY2011

The financial impact of these strategies over the life of the Plan is illustrated by the following table. The out-year deficits depicted below are modest as they range from 0.6% to 1.0% of total expenses for the period FY2012 through FY2014 and 1.7% of total expenses in FY2015. As such, these deficits are manageable and will be addressed in future iterations of the Plan.
### Five Year Plan Summary ($ in 000's)

#### REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget FY'11</th>
<th>Plan FY'12</th>
<th>Plan FY'13</th>
<th>Plan FY'14</th>
<th>Plan FY'15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td>111,142</td>
<td>118,209</td>
<td>125,076</td>
<td>132,336</td>
<td>139,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR)</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Raising</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>3,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment &amp; Interest Income</td>
<td>2,936</td>
<td>2,895</td>
<td>2,922</td>
<td>3,232</td>
<td>3,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY State Bundy Aid</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Income</td>
<td>19,782</td>
<td>20,604</td>
<td>21,252</td>
<td>22,028</td>
<td>22,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>1,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>143,469</strong></td>
<td><strong>151,045</strong></td>
<td><strong>158,325</strong></td>
<td><strong>166,610</strong></td>
<td><strong>174,679</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget FY'11</th>
<th>Plan FY'12</th>
<th>Plan FY'13</th>
<th>Plan FY'14</th>
<th>Plan FY'15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>69,769</td>
<td>72,380</td>
<td>75,783</td>
<td>79,083</td>
<td>82,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>32,214</td>
<td>33,221</td>
<td>35,613</td>
<td>36,688</td>
<td>38,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities/Repairs/Renovations</td>
<td>8,194</td>
<td>8,828</td>
<td>9,776</td>
<td>10,794</td>
<td>11,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships &amp; Student Aid</td>
<td>12,090</td>
<td>13,722</td>
<td>14,677</td>
<td>17,109</td>
<td>18,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Than Personnel Services (OTPS) &amp; Professional Services (1)</td>
<td>11,973</td>
<td>11,923</td>
<td>12,013</td>
<td>12,105</td>
<td>12,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC Press (2)</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>4,069</td>
<td>4,191</td>
<td>4,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service (3)</td>
<td>6,420</td>
<td>5,993</td>
<td>5,993</td>
<td>5,993</td>
<td>7,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Relief</td>
<td>(3,140)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>143,469</strong></td>
<td><strong>152,017</strong></td>
<td><strong>159,924</strong></td>
<td><strong>167,963</strong></td>
<td><strong>177,696</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Surplus/(Deficit)    | -            | (973)      | (1,599)    | (1,354)    | (3,016)    |

(1) OTPS includes such items as property insurance, office supplies, printing, rent; Professional Services include legal, consulting, actuarial, auditing, contract and other professional services

(2) TC Press excludes salaries and benefits

(3) Includes $1.2 million of swap negative carry in FY ’11
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