TEACHERS COLLEGE COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

SELECTED TOPICS SELF-STUDY PROPOSAL

INTRODUCTION

Founded in 1887 to provide a new kind of schooling for the teachers of poor, immigrant children in New York City, Teachers College is the oldest and largest graduate school of education in the United States. Its name notwithstanding, the College is committed to a vision of education writ large, encompassing health, education, and psychology. Teachers College sees its leadership role in two complementary arenas. One is as a major player in policy-making to ensure that schools are reformed and restructured to welcome all students regardless of their socio-economic circumstances. The other is in preparing educators who not only serve students directly but coordinate the educational, psychological, behavioral, technological, and health initiatives to remove barriers to learning at all ages. For more than 100 years Teachers College has continued to:

- Engage in research on the central issues facing education
- Prepare the next generation of education leaders
- Educate the current generation of leaders in practice and policy
- Shape the public debate and public policy in education
- Improve practice in educational institutions

Teachers College’s seventh President, Lawrence Cremin, wrote that the College “has been at the forefront of every major movement, issue and conflict in American education.” It has been the birthplace of new ideas, practices, and fields of inquiry. Teachers College’s legacy of “firsts” begins with the College itself, the blueprint for all subsequent schools of education. Its unique, multi-disciplinary blend of theory and practice led to many other “firsts,” including such fields of study as educational psychology, social studies, urban education, gifted education, special education, conflict resolution, nursing education, and international and comparative education. The College’s past accomplishments constitute a foundation from which we are once again meeting society’s needs and anticipating the needs of the future.

In her 2012 State of the College address and in preparation for the Teachers College’s 125th anniversary year, TC’s current President Susan Fuhrman said, “I am in awe of the vision of our founders and early leaders who created and nurtured a great institution dedicated to innovation and agile enough not only to adapt to the time but to lead change and set the standard for all other schools of education to come. Now is our time to reinvent ourselves once again—to build on our strengths, to embrace our distinctions and to create an institution that honors the past while transforming the future.” In celebrating its 125th Anniversary, Teachers College has confirmed its commitment to live up to its legacy, that is, to pursue its mission of educational improvement and social justice by creating and shaping new fields to meet the challenges of the time and anticipate the direction of education, health, and psychology.
NATURE AND SCOPE OF SELF-STUDY

To build on its legacy and to advance its future “firsts,” Teachers College has chosen a “selected topics” model for the self-study. Our self-study will focus on developing a process model for re-inventing programs of study informed by data derived from graduates’ career paths and their perceptions of the quality and professional relevance of their programs. The intended outcomes of the self-study are the program initiatives that are connecting the dots and thinking creatively about what our students need to succeed and lead in the 21st century.

The proposed theme is a particularly appropriate framework for campus discussion and self-study, as the College, re-invigorated by its 125 anniversary reflections and festivities, has launched its historic $300 million campaign, “Where the Future Comes First, the Campaign for Teachers College.” For 125 years, Teachers College has not only met the challenges of the times, but anticipated the direction of education, health, and psychology. The main goal of the campaign is to strengthen the College’s capacity to create and lead the next chapter in this great transformation and to renew our distinctive legacy of firsts, which have transformed the education, health and well-being of individuals and communities, enabling them to flourish and create a better future for New York City, the nation, and the world.

One of the Campaign’s four priorities is to invest in faculty and programs, to attract and retain world-class teachers and researchers who create leading-edge fields of practice and inquiry through programs and partnerships with global influence and impact. Particularly important for the self-study is the Campaign’s objective to invest in research and program initiatives that connect the dots between disciplines and fields to advance Teachers College’s historic legacy of firsts and influence policy and practice in the fields of education, health, and psychology. Campus discussions generated by the proposed self-study will help to identify specific program initiatives that can most benefit from the Campaign.

The proposed self-study theme also presents an opportunity to take a look back at our 1986 selected topics self-study titled “A Process Model for Designing a Continuing Education Agenda,” which also focused on outcome data derived from graduates’ perceptions of the quality and relevance of the ongoing degree programs. The results of the 1986 self-study and the developments of the past 30 years will provide the College with the historical insight on its legacy and its future.

In addition to developing a process model for reinventing our programs and taking stock of College’s history, the proposed self-study will generate information and insights that will aid College in responding to the changing trends and times in higher education, in general, and schools of education, in particular.

We expect that the self-study will help to better position Teachers College to compete with new and emerging competitors. As indicated by the College’s Enterprise Risk Assessment and Management process, its primary vulnerability is a variety of alternative providers and different delivery modalities. Our competitors include programs that are not embedded in scholarship and research like ours, such as Teach for America or NY Teaching Fellows, as well as online degree programs, like those offered by Kaplan School of Graduate Education or Drexel University Online, or those offered by the Relay Graduate School of Education, a non-university based program. By engaging in this self-study, we aim to address the questions of quality, relevance, and innovativeness of our programs.
We also expect that the information generated by the proposed self-study will help the College and
individual programs to respond to the escalating external accountability mandates. Policymakers
and the public are demanding that colleges and universities hold down costs and at the same time
new burdens for reporting and compliance multiply, and new accountability and accreditation
demands pose escalating challenges. Besides its regional accreditation, Teachers College programs
respond to 17 specialty professional accrediting agencies and at least three more programs
(Community Health Education, Psychological Counseling, and Coaching) are in the process of
applying for professional accreditations. One program, School Psychology, has to respond to two
very different accrediting organizations (APA and NASP), in addition to the two College-wide
accreditations by MSCHE and CAEP (former NCATE). Increasingly, accrediting agencies are focusing
on what students learn and can do while in the program and after graduation. By focusing our self-
study on program learning goals and graduates’ self-evaluations and perceptions of program
effectiveness, we will provide programs with solid data to use in accreditation and other
accountability activities.

Finally, by asking our graduates and experts to anticipate future developments in their professional
fields, we will be able to better position our programs to meet the future needs of their disciplines
or professions. With rapid technological and informational advances, an M.A. has become an entry
degree and, we believe, there is a need for seasoned professional/specialist level degrees to
advance fields of inquiry or professions. We will use the results of the self-study to develop a
distinct identity or identities for our specialist (Ed.M.) level programs.

In sum, the purpose of the self-study is to support faculty in rethinking, redesigning, and
reinventing programs to strengthen our capacity to teach students in the most compelling and
effective ways possible. Hence the theme of this self-study can be expressed by the question, how
might Teachers College re-design its programs of study to meet the challenges of the time and
anticipate the direction of education, health, and psychology? Given today’s limited resources, and the
growth and development opportunities enabled by the Capital Campaign, how can Teachers College
leverage current capacities, new knowledge environments, and external relationships to maximize our
ability to advance our educational excellence?

The intended outcomes of this study include:

- Holding ourselves up to the highest standards as outlined by our peers in higher education
- Creating a process for continuous reflection, self-assessment, and improvement
- Simultaneously responding to the needs of our students, alumni, and the field
- Improving our programs and, therefore, outcomes
- Collaborating across program and/or departmental boundaries

The College has already made a first step to create administrative structures to facilitate the
process of program redesign. In the fall of 2013, the Provost restructured the Academic Affairs area
of the College and assigned major responsibility to Vice Provost Bill Baldwin, who also serves as a
co-chair of the Self-Study Steering Committee, to assemble a team within the administration to
work proactively with faculty on program design to meet changing market needs and to
successfully engage the much more competitive landscape faced by many of our programs. This
work will require active use of what we know about accreditation and state regulations, as well as
the changing conditions of professional programs at the College, to adapt our academic structure to
the challenges we face in maintaining our preeminence across our various fields.
ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE AND WORKING GROUPS

STEERING COMMITTEE

I. Co-Chairs:
   • Bill Baldwin, Vice Provost
   • A. Lin Goodwin, Vice Dean and Professor, C&T

II. Faculty:
   • Harold Abeles, Professor, Music Education, A&H
   • Matthew Johnson, Associate Professor, Statistics and Education, HUD
   • Douglas Ready, Associate Professor, Education Policy, EPSA
   • Laura Smith, Associate Professor, Counseling Psychology, CCP
   • Lyle Yorks, Associate Professor, Adult & Continuing Education, O&L

III. Administrators and Professional Staff:
   • Steve H. Ackerman, Director, Continuing and Professional Studies
   • Hui Soo Chae, Associate Director, Gottesman Libraries
   • Katie Conway, Deputy Chief of Staff, President’s Office
   • Katie Embree, Associate Provost
   • Sasha Gribovskaya, Director, Accreditation and Assessment
   • Henry Perkowski, Associate Vice President and Controller, Controller’s Office
   • Tom Rock, Associate Dean, Enrollment Services
   • Scott Rubin, Executive Director, Development and External Affairs
   • Scott Schnackenberg, Director, Institutional Studies

IV. Students:
   • Matthew B. Harty, Ed.M. Student, O&L
   • Vikash Reddy, Ph.D. Student, EPSA

V. Alumnae:
   • Jennifer Robinson, Executive Director of the Center Of Pedagogy, Montclair State University
   • Deborah Shanley, Dean, School of Education, Brooklyn College
   • Nicole Vartanian, Vice President, Education at Intrepid Sea, Air & Space Museum

VI. Trustees:
   • Eduardo Marti, retired, most recently served as Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges of the City University of New York and is president emeritus of Queensborough Community College
   • TBA
WORKING GROUPS

I. Documentation and Roadmap Group:
   • Sam Fugazzotto, Associate Registrar, Registrar’s and Doctoral Studies
   • Suzanne Jablonski, Director of Facilities
   • Jason Jones, HRIS Manager, Human Resources
   • Jerée Matherson, Postgraduate Fellow, President’s Office
   • Omar Mayyasi, Director of Budget and Planning
   • Laura O’Connell, Director of Capital Projects
   • Henry Perkowski, Associate Vice President and Controller, Controller’s Office
   • Scott Rubin, Executive Director, Development and External Affairs
   • Scott Schnackenberg, Director, Institutional Studies

II. Survey Group:
   • Katie Conway, Deputy Chief of Staff, President’s Office
   • Rosella Garcia, Senior Director of Alumni Relations
   • Matthew Johnson, Associate Professor, Statistics and Education, HUD
   • Douglas Ready, Associate Professor, Education Policy, EPSA
   • Vikash Reddy, PhD Student, EPSA
   • Scott Schnackenberg, Director, Institutional Studies
   • Clarice Sng, Associate Director, Accreditation and Assessment

III. Design and Program Review Group:
   • Bill Baldwin, Vice Provost
   • Katie Embree, Associate Provost
   • Lin Goodwin, Vice Dean and Professor, C&T
   • Eduardo Marti, retired, most recently served as Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges of the City University of New York and is president emeritus of Queensborough Community College
   • Jennifer Robinson, Executive Director of the Center Of Pedagogy, Montclair State University
   • Coordinators/representatives of participating programs

IV. Advanced Master’s Program Group:
   • Harold Abeles, Professor, Music Education, A&H
   • Bill Baldwin, Vice Provost
   • Haley Rosenfeld, Associate Director for Enrollment Research, Institutional Studies
   • Deborah Shanley, Dean, School of Education, Brooklyn College
   • Lyle Yorks, Associate Professor, Adult & Continuing Education, O&L
   • Corbin Campbell, Assistant Professor, Higher Education, O&L
   • Coordinators/representatives of participating Ed.M. programs
CHARGES TO THE WORKING GROUPS AND GUIDELINES FOR THEIR REPORTS

Our self-study will focus on a set of research questions (described below) calibrated in four standards:

**Standard 11:** The institution’s educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence that are appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.

**Standard 14:** Assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation, or other appropriate points, the institution’s students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals.

**Standard 2:** An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and goals, develops objectives to achieve them, and utilizes the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.

**Standard 7:** The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.

Depending on the results of the self-study, there is a possibility for addressing **Standard 13** (The institution’s programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards) through new non-traditional programming options (certificate, distance learning, international)).

---

CHARGES TO WORKING GROUPS

Teachers College has convened four working groups, two of which will be data and analysis engines for others. Steering Committee members chair and participate in the working groups to assure continuity and integration. Below, each working group is introduced with a description of its focus, research questions and corresponding standards.

1) **Documentation and Roadmap Group**, representing key administrative departments and offices, will collect documentation demonstrating Teachers College’s compliance with the standards not addressed in the Selected Topics Self-Study and construct a document roadmap. This work involves reviewing and categorizing the collected documentation, annotating the collection to make clear how the documents demonstrate compliance with the Middle State standards. This group will also collect documentation to complement and inform the work being done in other working groups.

2) **Survey Group** will audit varied surveys administered across the College, documenting their purposes and intended audiences, identifying informational needs and inefficiencies, and developing a comprehensive policy for survey development and administration. This group will also review and revise the Alumni Feedback Survey questionnaire, which will serve as a baseline for program reviews, administer the survey, and analyze data to inform the work...
being done in other working groups. As we formalize the self-study design (see working group 3 below) to include program-specific approaches to collecting additional information about program graduates, we anticipate that the focus of this work group will evolve to assist in choosing appropriate methodologies and developing strategies for additional data collection.

| Standard 7 | What information does Teacher College collect through various surveys? How effective is the College in analyzing and utilizing survey results? How do various surveys fit into the Institutional Assessment Plans? What informational needs are not being addressed by existing surveys? What should be done to improve the survey program? |
| Standard 14 | How well do the Alumni Feedback Survey and other surveys assess graduates’ and students’ perceptions of their learning experiences and outcomes? How should the Alumni Feedback Survey be improved to produce data that can be used in program and institutional review and improvement? |

3) **Design and Program Review Group** will start with developing a conceptual framework and research questions to guide program reviews. This work will also involve selecting programs for the initial round of reviews and suggesting appropriate methodologies for data collection and analysis. Once the programs are selected, group membership will expand to include program representatives. The group will guide selected programs in conducting reviews and identifying opportunities for growth and aggregate program review results across the College.

| Standard 14 | How do Teachers College graduates assess quality and relevance of their programs? |
|             | • What evidence do they provide to support their evaluation? What quality indicators do they identify? |
|             | • How satisfied are they with the preparation they received? How prepared did they feel upon graduation? Upon entry to the field? |
|             | • How do they assess their preparation in relation to their peers in the field? |
|             | • How do they define quality of preparation in relation to where they feel their field is heading? |

| Standard 11 | How well aligned is the program (course of study, course offerings, content, experiences) to the demands/requirements of the field? |
|             | • In what way does the curriculum represent cutting edge thinking in their field? |
|             | • What are the strengths of program curriculum? |
|             | • What are apparent gaps or weaknesses in the program curriculum? |
| Standard 2 | How do Teachers College graduates define innovation in relation to their program? What should Teachers College be planning for? What improvements/innovations can enhance program quality and curriculum?  
|---|---|
|  | • What kinds of innovations do graduates describe learning about or benefiting from when they were students at TC?  
|  | • What firsts or accomplishments do they identify with TC? With their program at TC?  
|  | • When they look into the future of their field profession, what innovative practices/ideas/programs do they feel TC should develop?  
|  | • How can Teachers College planning, resource allocation, and assessment processes better assist academic programs in program redesign and innovation?  

4) **Advanced Master’s Program Group:** Teachers College currently offers more than 30 programs of study leading to the award of the Masters of Education (Ed.M.) degree. While this constitutes an advanced master’s degree at Teachers College (requiring a minimum of 60 graduate credits), for many higher education institutions the Masters of Education is an initial master’s degree, typically requiring 30-35 credits, leading to a not insignificant level of confusion regarding the credential. Additionally, while these programs have annually enrolled approximately 510 students (slightly more that 10% of our overall enrollments), more than half of the students are enrolled in 3 programs that lead to licensure or certification. As a special topic within our selected topics model, we are approaching the advanced master’s as an opportunity for the College to review and potentially redesign/refocus existing programs and/or to develop new programs that would capture new markets and audiences for the College. This work group will begin that effort by focusing on the review of those Ed.M. programs that do not lead to certification or licensure, including their foci, goals and learning outcomes, curricula, enrollment and graduation statistics, and positions graduates of these program hold. This work will also include investigating the use of the advanced master’s in peer institutions and identifying opportunities for advanced master’s programs in changing higher education and labor markets.

| Standard 14 | How do Teachers College Ed.M. graduates assess quality and relevance of their programs?  
|---|---|
|  | • What evidence do they provide to support their evaluation? What quality indicators do they identify?  
|  | • How satisfied are they with the preparation they received? How prepared did they feel upon graduation? Upon entry to the field?  
|  | • How do they assess their preparation in relation to their peers in the field?  
|  | • How do they define quality of preparation in relation to where they feel their field is heading?  


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 11</th>
<th>How well aligned is the Ed.M. program (course of study, course offerings, content, experiences) to the demands/requirements of the field?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In what way does the curriculum represent cutting edge thinking in their field?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are the strengths of program curriculum?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are apparent gaps or weaknesses in the program curriculum?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 2</th>
<th>How do Teachers College Ed.M. graduates define innovation in relation to their program? What should Teachers College be planning for? What improvements/innovations can enhance program quality and curriculum?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What kinds of innovations do Ed.M. graduates describe learning about or benefiting from when they were students at TC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What firsts or accomplishments do they identify with TC? With their program at TC?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When they look into the future of their field profession, what innovative practices/ ideas/ programs do they feel TC should develop?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How can Teachers College planning, resource allocation, and assessment processes better assist academic programs in program redesign and innovation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEMPLATE FOR A WORKING GROUP REPORT**

- An overview of the group’s charge, and the questions it addressed
- An analytical discussion of the inquiry undertaken and the outcomes of that inquiry, including strengths and challenges
- An explanation of how the group’s findings and conclusions related to the Commission’s standards
- Discussion of the connection of the group’s topic with those of the other groups, and of any collaboration between groups that took place
- Recommendations for improvement
INVENTORY OF SUPPORT DOCUMENTS

STANDARDS TO BE COVERED BY THE SELECTED TOPICS SELF-STUDY

The self-study working groups will determine what data and documents they need. They will include at least the following:

- Teachers College Catalog
- Institutional Plan for the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness
- Institutional Plan for the Assessment of Student Learning
- Academic programs’ assessment plans
- Academic programs’ accreditation reports when available
- Alumni Feedback Survey questionnaire and reports
- Other survey instruments and reports
- Descriptions and statistics for relevant programs

STANDARDS TO BE COVERED BY THE DOCUMENT REVIEW

We have completed a preliminary audit of documents to demonstrate compliance with the MSCHE standards and fundamental elements not covered in the Selected Topics Self-Study. In the coming months the Documentation and Roadmap Group will collect and organize all documents, adding explanations of the relevance of documents (i.e., creating roadmap).

Standard 1: Mission and Goals

- Mission and vision statements in TC Catalog and other publications
- Presidential strategic goals
- Presidential addresses and initiatives
- Provost and Vice Presidents’ goals and reports (Trustee Briefings)

Standard 2: Planning

- Enterprise Risk Management Plan
- Technology Plan
- Capital Campaign Plan
- Physical Facilities Plan
- Planning and budgeting process
- Institutional Plan for the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness
- Institutional Plan for the Assessment of Student Learning

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

- Financial statements/reports
- Human resources
- Physical facilities
- Library resources
- Admissions reports

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance
• Governing documents, charter and bylaws
• Board of Trustees information: structure, policies, members
• Sample agendas and minutes from Board meetings
• Orientation materials for new trustees
• Job description and qualifications of President
• Faculty Handbook
• Sample agendas and minutes from faculty meetings
• Student Handbook
• Sample agendas and minutes from Student Senate meetings
• Policies Library

Standard 5: Administration

• Organizational charts
• Faculty Handbook
• Human resources website

Standard 6: Integrity

• Policies Library

Standard 7: Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness

• Presidential goals and reports (Trustee Briefings)
• Institutional Report for the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness
• Institutional Report for the Assessment of Student Learning
• Administrative unit assessment plans and reports
• Academic program assessment plans and reports

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

• TC Catalog
• Admission website and other materials
• Marketing and promotional materials
• Statistics on retention and graduation

Standard 9: Student Support Services

• TC Catalog
• Student Handbook
• Student Satisfaction Survey
• Quality of Life and Exit Surveys

Standard 10: Faculty

• Faculty credentials—Faculty Annual Reports, HR data
• Faculty Handbook
• Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure documents
• New Faculty Orientation materials
• Faculty Mentoring Program materials
• Faculty Stuffing/Permission to Recruit Process
• Affirmative Action Reports
• Professional development funds
• Instructional workload data/reports
• Faculty/student ratios

Standard 12: General Education

n/a

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

• NYS program registration materials for online and additional location programs
  o Educational Technology—online
  o Diabetes Education and Management—online
  o Summer Principal Academy—New Orleans
  o Leadership and Educational Change—Singapore
• Assessment plans and reports for online and additional location programs
• Continuing education programs
• IACET accreditation materials and report
We expect to structure the report approximately along these lines:

I. Executive Summary and Certification Statement
   • A brief (1-5 pages) description of the major findings and recommendations of the self-study. An explanation of which standards are covered wholly or partially in the self-study and which in the document review.
   • The completed Certification Statement attached to the Executive Summary.

II. Introduction
   • A brief overview of the institution and description of the self-study process.

III. Topic by topic discussion—for each topic:
   • Identification and description of topic
   • Kinds of evidence considered and analysis thereof
   • Evaluation of problems and opportunities
   • Recommendations
   • Mapping from topic to standard(s)

IV. Conclusion
   • A summary of the major conclusions reached and recommendations offered in the report.

V. Appendices
   • A compilation of supporting documents available to the evaluation team.
EDITORIAL STYLE AND FORMAT OF ALL REPORTS

To aid the Steering Committee in assembling a report, format guidelines will be disseminated. These are likely to include the following:

• Microsoft Word for text
• Microsoft Excel for tables, charts, and graphs
• 12 point Times New Roman font
• Single-spaced, single-column, left-justified text
• 1-inch margins
• APA style footnotes
• Main headings Title Case, centered, and bold
• Secondary headings Title Case, left-justified, and bold
• Tertiary headings Title Case, underscored, end with colon, at start of paragraph

The Co-chairs will be responsible for the final integration and editing of the self-study report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2013</td>
<td>President/Provost selects Steering Committee co-chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>Provost announces Middle States Self-Study Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Committee co-chairs attend MSCHE’s Self-Study Institute <em>(November 13-14)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-chairs, in consultation with faculty and administration, choose Teachers College self-study model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSCHE staff liaison schedules self-study preparation visit to Teachers College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>First meeting of Steering Committee <em>(February 19)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Committee drafts Selected Topics Preliminary Proposal and submits it to MSCHE staff liaison <em>(March 31)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Committee determines types of working groups and charge questions <em>(April 1-20)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Committee drafts Self-Study Design Proposal and submits it to MSCHE staff liaison for review <em>(April 28)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSCHE staff liaison conducts self-study preparation visit and approves the Self-Study Design <em>(May 8)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
<td>Steering Committee revises Self-Study Design Proposal based on MSCHE staff liaison feedback <em>(no revisions necessary)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni Feedback Survey is administered <em>(July)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Staff discusses work to date at the Senior Staff Retreat <em>(July 23)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working groups begin work to address self-study questions <em>(June-August)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Study Process website is launched <em>(August 31)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Working groups involve the community in addressing self-study questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni Feedback Survey results shared with pilot programs <em>(September)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steering Committee conducts regular communication outreach to Teachers College Community <em>(see Communication Plan)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter 2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>MSCHE selects the evaluation team chair and Teachers College approves the selection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair and Teachers College select dates for team visit and for the Chair's preliminary visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers College sends Self-Study Design to the Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>Working groups incorporate Steering Committee's feedback</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Steering Committee conducts regular communication outreach to Teachers College Community</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Working group chairs present revised reports to Steering Committee meeting (March 30)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Steering Committee integrates working group reports into draft Self-Study Report (May)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>Senior Staff reviews draft Self-Study Report at the annual retreat (July)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Steering Committee revises draft Self-Study Report based on feedback (August)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2015</strong></td>
<td><strong>Teachers College community and Board of Trustees review draft Self-Study Report (September-October)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Steering Committee revises a draft Self-Study Report based on feedback (October)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Teachers College sends a draft Self-Study Report to evaluation team Chair (end of October)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Team Chair makes preliminary visit at least four months prior to team visit (November)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Generalist evaluator conducts an early document review (October-November)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Teachers College prepares a final version of Self-Study Report</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MSCHE appoints Evaluation Team</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Winter 2016 | Teachers College sends Self-Study Report to evaluation team and to MSCHE at least six weeks prior to team visit  
Self-Study Report is available to TC community on the website |
| Spring 2016 | Team visit *(March-April)*  
Evaluation Team sends report to Teachers College  
Teachers College responds to Evaluation Team Report with factual corrections  
Team Chair sends formal report to MSCHE |
| Summer 2016 | Committee on Evaluation Reports meets  
Commission action |
PROFILE OF THE VISITING EVALUATION TEAM

Over the past self-study and periodic review studies, Teachers College has benefited from having our work and aspirations affirmed by peer evaluators. We are confident that our next evaluation team will be as thoughtful and encouraging in their review as our past evaluation teams have been. We appreciate an opportunity to work with our MSCHE staff liaison to shape the composition of our evaluation team and select a chair.

Ideally, we would like to see a team leader who has presidential (or senior administrative) experience at a research intensive, tuition-dependent, public or private institution. He or she will also have prior experience as an evaluation team chair or team member.

As an institution, Teachers College possesses a number of characteristics that make it somewhat atypical of the institutions reviewers will normally visit. Even though the name of Teachers College may suggest a primary focus on teacher preparation, in reality, the College offers graduate and professional programs across a variety of disciplines in education, psychology and health. Ideally, we would like to see a team leader who has familiarity with graduate and professional schools, particularly those with a range of programs that would map well to our distribution of programs.

Considering Teachers College’s nature (research intensive, graduate only), size, and geography (urban), evaluation team members who might be well suited to participating in this peer review will include faculty and administrators with experience in program development and innovation in graduate and professional education, in research intensive institutions, and in urban institutions.

Teachers College takes great pride in celebrating the diversity of its students, faculty, employees, and the communities it serves. As such, ethnic and/or racial diversity within the evaluation team would be welcome.