CHAPTER 1: VISION AND LEADERSHIP

INTRODUCTION

This chapter chronicles the continuity and change in the formation of a coherent academic mission and vision establishing priorities for the university that accompanied the January 2011 transition in leadership in presidency from Bob Kerrey to David Van Zandt. While President Kerrey's years were often tumultuous, a core accomplishment was The New School's transformation from a conglomeration of largely independent academic units to a more integrated institution. Still very much a work-in-progress, the emergence of a university from a loose confederacy of academic units enabled the first steps toward articulating a mission and vision beginning with David Van Zandt's arrival and culminating in the May 2013 Board approval of the first formally adopted university-wide mission and vision statement. The statement asserts priorities based on curricular strengths in design and in the social sciences, promotes a distinct focus on creativity and innovation, and emphasizes civic and public engagement with both a local focus on New York City and a global orientation.

This chapter describes the effect of the many related changes in the university's leadership since the 2003 self-study. Under President Van Zandt, university governance is focusing on data-gathering to inform decision-making, acquiring knowledge about the student experience, greater transparency, and shared governance.

SECTION I: THE 2013 MISSION, VISION, AND EDUCATIONAL APPROACH

At the time of the last reaccreditation review, The New School was looking closely at its structure of the then eight largely independent academic divisions contained within a university that, despite shared academic values across its units, lacked an identity of its own. That year, the Visiting Team from Middle States described the institution as "an important constellation in the academic universe; each of its eight stars shine brightly; the struggle is to determine the pattern they reveal."[1] This section analyzes the progress on the articulation of a university-wide mission and vision statement and the forging of institutional goals that adhere to the mission statement. The pattern alluded to in the quotation from the last self-study has emerged through an active process of discussion, debate, and collaboration that has sought to involve all constituencies in decision-making processes.

The strong divisional identities referenced in the 2003 Visiting Team's statement were an artifact of The New School's unusual history of acquiring formerly freestanding units. This is the primary reason the university has never had a mission statement that applied to the institution as a whole.[2] While some divisions had articulated missions, it was only in preparation for the 2003 self-study that a university mission and vision statement was drafted. However, it was never formally

[1] Visiting Team Report (2003: 4).The Middle States Visiting Team visited the campus for three days, April 6–9, 2003, and recommended changes to the university. The self-study resulted in a renewal of accreditation by the Middle States Commission, commendation for the self-study report, and renewed accreditation by NASAD.

[2] The New School did not identify itself as a "university until its name was changed to 'New School University'" in 1997. Then in 2005, the name was changed to The New School and the divisions were rebranded to include The New School in their names, which is evidence of a real uncertainty in terms of institution-wide identity.

Draft

presented to the Board of Trustees for a vote, and thus never formally adopted, publicized to the community, or shared with external constituencies.

In subsequent years, the question of a broader university identity became a frequent topic of discussion among university leadership, albeit more around the pursuit of academic planning than as a formal mission statement. The core role of design in that broader identity—given Parsons' place in the institution in terms of enrollment, revenue, and academics—was a major component of these discussions. In 2009, in tandem with the presidential search, the Board commissioned the Center for Applied Research (CFAR) to conduct a survey of the university community to assess the climate among faculty and administrative staff on the common themes shared by the divisions, perceptions of The New School's brand, and the challenges a new president would face. The CFAR report[3] identified common academic ground among the divisions, and ascribed those shared elements more to pedagogical innovation and progressive politics than to specific curricular offerings. At the same time, some respondents were skeptical about the expectation that design could be effectively integrated across the university and others were reluctant to embrace a central brand.[4]

When David Van Zandt became president in 2011, the Board of Trustees charged him with initiating a strategic planning process to ensure the viability and effectiveness of The New School. At a Board retreat in November of that year, the Trustees expressed their understanding of The New School's unique role in higher education, and the need for a formal articulation of that role in guiding the strategic planning process. The president, with the provost and deans, drafted a vision document to serve as the foundation for establishing academic priorities, guiding resource allocation, and informing possible changes to the university's academic organization. The statement paid special attention to the university's niche in a dramatically changing landscape of national and global higher education.

Over the course of 2011 and 2012, the draft mission and vision statement was circulated among faculty and senior administrators and revised. After multiple Town Halls organized by President Van Zandt and Provost Marshall, meetings with students and divisional faculty, discussions with the Board, and the dissemination of a study conducted by the design research firm IDEO, the statement was posted on the university's website on November 14, 2012, with a message from the president and provost inviting community feedback. In the weeks leading up to the end of the fall 2012 semester, students, faculty, administrators, trustees, and alumni responded.[5] Their input led to the circulation of a revised version of The New School mission and vision statement, which was posted on March 21, 2013. Comments from around the university were solicited and subsequently incorporated. The Board, presided over by Joseph R. Gromek, who became Chair in November 2012, adopted a final version of the mission and vision statement on May 16, 2013.[6]

[3] Report findings can be found in Appendix 1.I.
[4] A sample of comments can be found in Appendix 1.I.
[5] A sample of comments can be found in Appendix 1.II.
[6] Copies of the website URLs and of the correspondence referenced in this paragraph can be found in Appendix 1.II.

The current mission and vision statement includes an educational approach. It reads:

> The New School prepares students to understand, contribute to, and succeed in a rapidly changing society, and thus make the world a better and more just place. We will ensure that our students have not only the abilities that a sound liberal arts education provides, but also the competencies essential for success and leadership in the emerging creative economy. We will also lead in generating practical and theoretical knowledge that seeks to understand our world and improve global and local communities and the lives of people within them.

The entire statement is, in many ways, a formalization of the university's unique and somewhat unusual place in higher education: "The New School's future will be shaped by the core values that have define our past."[7] Two values are highlighted, having emerged from the historical practices of the university's divisions. The first value, comprising creativity, innovation, and a willingness to challenge the status quo, is reflected in the extraordinary place held by design and the creative and performing arts at The New School. Currently more than half of The New School students are enrolled in design, music, drama, and other arts-oriented programs, which, again, is an atypical proportion for a university with more than 10,000 students. But this value is also embedded in The New School's liberal arts programs, in which the humanities are oriented toward the arts (not only music and drama, but also writing, the visual arts, and dance); and in the social sciences, which emphasize critical and interdisciplinary approaches while engaging the relationship between the aesthetic and the political dimensions of social life. Fields such as media studies and media-making are present across the institution, and the emergent area of social innovation connects professionally oriented programs of international affairs, policy, and management to the design and issues of social justice.

The second value, social engagement, has resonated within the university since its founding as a place for working adults to pursue higher learning, its role as the home of the University in Exile as a site for critical research on key public issues, and its current reputation for progressivism in scholarship and action. The extensive participation of members of this community in Occupy Wall Street and post-Hurricane Sandy recovery efforts, taking place even as discussions about articulating the mission and vision were on going, surprised no one familiar with The New School. Social engagement is currently reflected in the myriad ways students and faculty connect academic preparation with community work (both locally and globally) through internships and other forms of voluntarism, as well as the joining of two formerly separate academic units – Milano and General Studies – into The New School for Public Engagement. Many of the design programs also strongly emphasize community and social engagement, as do components of the performing arts programs.

In a sense, the current statement prioritizes the confluence of creativity and engagement, not just as a description of the past and present, but as an academic goal to be prioritized going forward. This is reflected in the statement's call to prepare students to "make the world a better and more just place" and to nurture the capacities that enable participation in "the emerging creative economy." The vision emphasizes problem-solving and states that The New School is and will be "a university where design and social research drive approaches to studying the issues of our time."

[7] Mission and vision statement.

Draft

Since the mid-2000s, the university's academic leadership has focused on the intersection of these strengths in terms of building new academic programs, increased research, and more collaborations. Indeed, the drafting period of the mission and vision statement coincided with a range of cross-divisional partnerships centered on innovation and civic engagement, including participation in the U.S. Department of Energy's Solar Decathlon; a Social Innovation Initiative supported by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation; a university lecture course on "The New School Century: A History"; and other events which are discussed in detail in other chapters.

The emphasis on design and the importance of design thinking and project-based learning is unique in U.S. higher education, and has produced some concerns in parts of the university community outside of Parsons. Given that Parsons enrolls about half of the total number of The New School students, given its national and international reputation as a design school, and given the growing importance of design thinking and skills more broadly in the academy and the professions, there are both scholarly and practical reasons to place design centrally alongside the liberal arts in The New School's vision. Hence, there have been multiple efforts in recent years to infuse design with other curricula at The New School for the mutual benefit of all students.

The mission and vision statement thus organizes and codifies longstanding values and strengths as the core foci of academic innovation and investment. Unfortunately, not all parts of the university see themselves equally in the current formulation. The relatively small but highly regarded performing arts programs have called attention to the highlighting of design and social research but not performance in the vision statement, while at the same time responding proactively to broaden a conservatory approach in ways that engage with design and the liberal arts. The intent of the articulation is to inflect all the fields of the university's engagement with a design and social research perspective and approach, not to limit its activities to these two areas. The debate will continue, but at least the context for it will be a clear formulation to which to respond, and a commitment to dialogue and flexibility.

At the same May 16, 2013 Board of Trustees meeting in which the mission and vision statement was approved, President Van Zandt and Provost Marshall presented a proposal for actualizing the mission and vision now developed as a strategic plan (see Chapter 2). Recognizing tremendous changes in store for private higher education, including increased competition from online providers, new kinds of certification systems, and changing employer expectations, the proposal especially emphasized a need to address The New School's unique role and to deploy resources that correspond to the new vision. After years of haphazard enrollment growth, it was also important to "right-size" the university while maintaining overall enrollment and redistributing students across programs without altering their quality, and to improve admission standards and student outcomes.

The strategic plan that emerged from the proposal identifies student success, academic success, globalization, and a strong external profile as key goals for the institution, as well as ensuring that the institution's resources and infrastructure are organized to support these goals. A key challenge is to address these goals while wrestling with the realities of a tuition-dependent financial model exacerbated by a two-year shortfall in projected enrollment. A major focus on the intersection of design and social research is underway because it can further the mission and goals while improving opportunities for the development of new programs to reach new students markets, thus

Draft

supporting the right-sizing effort and creating important positive and stabilizing fiscal consequences. While more on this effort and related activities is discussed in later chapters of this self-study, here it is emphasized that the articulation of the mission and vision statement, by building on existing strengths and shared values across the institution, serves as a focal point both for academic aspirations and for making The New School sustainable while maintaining its unique niche.

SECTION II: LEADERSHIP TRANSITIONS

As mentioned in the preamble, the university has faced numerous leadership challenges in the years since the 2003 self-study. This chapter elaborates on these challenges with an eye towards how they have informed the current governance structures and approaches.

The two principal leadership challenges were related. Marked instability in the Provost's Office began with the departure of Arjun Appadurai in May 2006, followed by Benjamin Lee in May 2008, and then Joseph Westphal in December 2008. After Provost Westphal's departure, President Bob Kerrey named himself interim provost, provoking a vote of no-confidence among the faculty for both the president and James Murtha, the executive vice president and chief operating officer.[8] Concurrently, a small group of students concerned with the instability, the president's leadership more generally, and the professional affiliations of a few members of the Board of Trustees, occupied a university building for 30 hours before peacefully departing after mediation by faculty members. A similar occupation in April 2009 ended after the university requested the intervention of the police, who made more than 20 arrests. These events garnered extremely negative media coverage for the university.[9]

Historically, the role of The New School's provost has been weak in comparison to other universities. Academic leadership rested mainly with divisional deans; fundraising responsibilities belonged to the president and deans; and resource allocation was negotiated bilaterally between the deans, the president, and executive vice president. Enormous changes set in motion in the mid-2000s by President Kerrey, EVP/COO Murtha, and academic leadership simultaneously created the need for stronger central academic authority (especially related to academic budgets) and deepened tensions between the academic and administrative arms of the university. These changes, outlined in the preamble, were driven by President Kerrey's goals to grow the student body (and thus revenue) mostly through the expansion of existing programs; knitting the divisions into a more integrated university; and enlarging the physical footprint of the university with an ambitious expansion, including construction of the University Center.

Not surprisingly, these goals created tensions in various parts of the institution. Divisions were deeply troubled by administrative staff being transferred to central offices. Enrollment growth concerned academic leadership, faculty, and current students who were alert to both the abilities of students admitted and the university's capacity to provide a quality education. At the same time, revenue generated by higher enrollments enabled aggressive growth in hiring full-time faculty (FTF), especially in divisions with a high ratio of part-time faculty (PTF). The University Center

[8] This information can be found in Appendix P.III.
[9] These articles can be found in Appendix P.II.

was a key solution to relieving space pressures for an urban university with no formal campus, but also a huge financial responsibility in terms of the bond issue needed to pay for much of it.

This was the backdrop against which the instability in the provost's role unfolded. A pattern evolved where each provost would develop an academic plan and a proposal for greater budgetary authority, only to no longer remain when their growth plan produced tension with other parts of the administration. As discussed in Chapter 3, the one area in which the Provost's Office began to exert leadership in the mid-2000s was the development of the *Full-Time Faculty Handbook*, which included a greater role for faculty in university governance and the possibility of tenure for faculty teaching across the university. As this and other changes unfolded, the provost and deans (and some of the faculty) began to call for a growth plan for student enrollment and physical plant that was rooted in academic goals and aspirations and informed by a resource allocation process that gave greater authority to central academic leadership.

The faculty votes of no-confidence, the student occupations, and the negative media attention prompted the trustees and president to create a new model of leadership. The president was charged with implementing a system of shared governance to increase transparency and input from other university constituents. One of the most important outcomes was a strengthened Provost's Office, which was given greater decision-making authority over the academic budget. Following the no-confidence vote, members of the faculty presented President Kerrey with a list of expectations for an interim provost, together with their recommendation that Tim Marshall, then serving as dean of Parsons, be named interim provost and serve for a period of approximately 18 months. With a more robust Provost's Office, Marshall was entrusted with academic planning, determining priorities for program growth, establishing faculty policies, and ensuring that university resources met teaching and learning objectives. Marshall remains in place to the present day, now serving formally as provost.

Other university constituencies now offer input into policy decisions, including the University Facilities Committee, comprising students, faculty, and administration, which was created under the co-leadership of Provost Marshall and Executive Vice President Murtha, to collect input on space-planning decisions. The request of some students for a student representative on the Board of Trustees has not been presented for a formal vote, but the Board did establish the Advisory Committee on Investor Responsibility as a format for faculty, staff, and students to have input on university investment decisions.

The Search for a New President

In May 2009, President Kerrey announced that he would step down the following year at the conclusion of his contract. Under the leadership of Michael Johnston, who became Board chair in October 2009, the Board of Trustees outlined a plan to identify The New School's eighth president, seeking to mirror the inclusivity that marked the final year of President Kerrey's tenure. The trustees engaged the executive search firm Spencer Stuart to guide the search, and created a process that included several opportunities for the university community to provide feedback.

In addition to the findings from the CFAR study discussed above, a website was developed that provided details about the search firm, search committee membership, the desired candidate

Draft

profile, search-related news and updates, and an opportunity to share and review comments from the community. The Board also disseminated an email[10] to the entire community of The New School that outlined the search committee's charge and its membership, which included three faculty representatives, one student, one staff member, and eight trustees. In March 2010, trustees and a representative from the search firm met with the University Faculty Senate to address faculty concerns over how the divisive nature of the campus and no-confidence vote would be addressed with prospective candidates, emphasizing "the role of openness and transparency throughout the search process."[11] [12]

The Van Zandt Presidency: 2011 to Present

David Van Zandt became president of The New School in January 2011, after serving for 15 years as the dean of the School of Law at Northwestern University.[13] His opening message[14] to the entire community indicated that he would work hard to lead the university to capitalize on areas of strength and to maintain The New School's legacy of change.

Upon arrival, President Van Zandt recognized the divisive nature of the leadership team and made a point of addressing an institutional environment that too often failed to solve problems collaboratively. Early initiatives thus focused on the provision of service, transparency, personnel and administrative structures, and the tone of engagement with university constituencies.

In early meetings with students, academic leadership, and senior administrators, he diagnosed that many areas of day-to-day operation were not adequately responsive to student needs, and that the culture of the university often forced students through numerous administrative hurdles. An early priority thus became a more service-oriented culture in relation to students and others. In announcing this Service Improvement Initiative, he explained, "Everyone at this university is both a service provider and service user at different times. Each and every one of us should be committed to helping each other and be responsible for the quality of our service culture."[15]

Immediately highlighted for special attention were a few key academic and administrative areas, including the broader organization of student financial and career services; the university's systems for email and expense reimbursement; and an online course catalog. Attention was also paid to a longstanding complaint of students in the difficulties of cross-registration from one division to another and different divisional bell schedules, which made it virtually impossible for students to take advantage of the breadth of university offerings in other divisions. Quickly, an online course catalog, a consistent bell schedule, and a new email system were implemented. Plans to improve student financial services and career services are ongoing and details are discussed in Chapter 4.

Draft

[10] These website URLs and copies of correspondence referenced in this paragraph can be found in Appendix 1.III
[11] *UFS Minutes*, March 2, 2010.
[12] The president's job description, which stressed collaborative working relationships, can be found Appendix 1.III.
[13] In addition to being an attorney and expert in legal education, President Van Zandt also holds a PhD in Sociology.
[14] See Appendix 1.IV.
[15] Service Improvement Initiative Message.

Transparency in university governance has been another key focal point, especially given that open and consistent communication between the administration and other constituencies have been a significant source of concern. Since President Van Zandt's arrival, the administration has grown increasingly accessible to students and faculty, addressing community-wide concerns through regular visits with student groups and frequent appearances at University Student Senate and University Faculty Senate meetings. As discussed in greater detail below, President Van Zandt reorganized the central administration and created the Leadership Council, an upper-level administrative body that includes faculty representation and in which university-wide financial and budgetary issues are discussed. Most generally, he has made an effort to share more details of university affairs, including finances, at university-wide Town Halls, which occur twice a semester during both daytime and evening hours to accommodate student and faculty schedules.[16]

In 2011, President Van Zandt made a number of changes designed to further shift responsibility to the university's academic leadership, thus reducing the number of senior administrative staff.[17] The visibility and role of the Provost's Office continued to expand, with the president and provost jointly making decisions, communicating as a team, and inviting academic and faculty perspectives into all university operations.

Lastly, the new leadership has engaged with constituencies in a very different tone, especially around tense situations. One clear example is related to student demonstrations and occupations. In tandem with the Occupy Wall Street movement, a group of students from several area institutions, including The New School, mounted a formal occupation of a New School student study center for more than a week in November 2011, the first occupation of university property since the 2009 protests against President Kerrey. President Van Zandt indicated that the occupation would be permitted to remain as long as other New School students were welcome to use the space for its intended purpose, regardless of their support of the Occupy movement. Over the ensuing days, reports of property destruction, intimidation, and hazardous conditions made it clear that the administration needed to bring an end to the occupation. Mindful of other campus demonstrations leading to confrontations with police occurring around the country at that time, the leadership was adamant not to rely on outside assistance. Instead, through negotiations and regular communication with protesters and the university community, the president and provost, with support from faculty and administrators, managed a peaceful resolution[18] without arrests or police involvement.

Draft

SECTION III: GOVERNANCE

The Board of Trustees

The New School is governed by a Board of Trustees, mandated to guide the university to fulfill its institutional mission, to provide oversight of university finances, to mobilize new resources, to select and supervise the president, and to oversee the president's implementation of a shared

[16] Beginning in 2012, Town Hall meetings have been LiveStreamed to maximize access. President Van Zandt has even experimented with social media at these events, receiving questions from those unable to attend through his Twitter feed (@DavidVanZandt).
[17] Current and pre-Van Zandt organizational charts can be found in Appendix 1.V.
[18] The resolution and related articles can be found in Appendix 1.VI.

governance structure that incorporates input from students, faculty, and, where relevant, members of the local community.[19]

The Board's capacity to chart a course for the university's future is exemplified by the roles the 42 trustees have in business, education, philanthropy, government, media, and other fields. The current board chair is Joseph R. Gromek, who was appointed in November 2012. He was previously the chair of Parsons' Board of Governors.

Beginning in 2011, then-Board Chair Michael Johnston, working in partnership with the Committee on Trusteeship, examined several challenges relevant to the board structure in place at the time of President Van Zandt's arrival, including its size (more than 50 members), the quality of engagement, the lack of a sense of community and social cohesion, the low number of alumni trustees, and a generational profile that made it difficult to engage younger members who have a different connection to the university.

Another major challenge was the schedule of board and committee meetings. With 11 committees (not including separate service on Boards of Governors, which is described below), trustees, on average, were scheduled for 11 meetings a year, with certain trustees scheduled for 20 or more meetings a year. Both board and committee meeting attendance were low, with a minority of trustees attending the majority of meetings. Over the course of 2011–2012, a number of changes were put in motion to overcome these governance challenges, approved as revisions to the bylaws at the Board's February 2013 meeting. These included a reduction in trustee standing committees from 11 to six (Executive, Academic Affairs, Audit & Risk, Finance, Investment, and Committee on Trusteeship) and creating a few smaller, project-based working groups. There was also a reduction in the number of annual Board of Trustee meetings from five to three and the encouragement of conference calls or interim meetings over the course of the year to improve the rate of regular trustee participation. Meeting times for many of the committees were moved to the beginning of the day in an effort to make the meetings more convenient for all members. Also, in 2013, the executive committee began meeting more frequently to address routine issues, allowing Board of Trustee meeting time to be used for strategic discussions.

The Boards of Governors

Each of The New School's academic divisions, except The New School for Drama, has a Board of Governors. Members of these Boards, who often overlap with the Board of Trustees, are selected because their professional expertise and interests are especially relevant to one or more university programs. While they lack formal governance authority and fiduciary responsibilities (which adhere only in the Board of Trustees), members of the Boards of Governors represent the programs, divisions, and the university in the external communities in which they live and work. They provide support and counsel to deans and administrators on such matters as student recruitment, educational programming, and fundraising. Boards of Governors meet between two and four times per year, though chairs or deans may call additional meetings at their discretion. Boards of Governors typically range in size from 10 to 25 members, depending on the needs of the academic division served.

[19] A list of the members of the Board and the Board's bylaws can be found in Appendix 1.VII.

Senior Leadership

Under President Kerrey, all deans and vice presidents, except the vice president responsible for Design, Construction, and Facilities Management and vice president for Communications and External Affairs, reported directly to the president. The former group met monthly in what was called the Deans and Officers group, and separately in regular meetings led by the Executive Vice President Murtha. In 2007, Provost Benjamin Lee also began regular meetings with the deans. This group, called the Deans' Council, continues to meet bi-weekly, often joined by the president. Senior administrative leadership was significantly revamped and reduced under President Van Zandt, with some hierarchy introduced within the reporting structure.[20]

President Van Zandt moved to discontinue the monthly meetings of deans and officers and to replace them with two other groupings of senior leadership. The Strategic Group, which consists of all vice presidents, deans, and several representatives of the Provost's Office, meets monthly. A smaller Leadership Council, comprising the president, provost, the vice presidents who directly report to the president, and the deans of Eugene Lang College, The New School for Public Engagement, The New School for Social Research, and Parsons. The Leadership Council meets every other week.

Significant change has also occurred in the Provost's Office. In 2009, when Tim Marshall became interim provost, the office had only two senior positions. Over the next three years, the staff grew to include a deputy provost and senior staff in the following areas: academic services, faculty affairs, curriculum and learning, distributed and global education, research support, institutional research, and planning and administration. Overall, the university has significantly invested in central academic leadership and governance while restructuring its central administration.

University Faculty Senate

Historically, The New School's loosely linked divisional structure and the small number of FTF meant that faculty played little role in governance. An elected University Faculty Senate (UFS) was not in place until 2004–2005.[21] Since that time, it has played a key role in the university's development. It was periodically consulted during the development of the 2006 *Full-Time Faculty Handbook*; and was more central in the 2008revisions, which culminated in the revised 2013 *Handbook*. It has also been involved in discussions and decision-making regarding many key university projects and policies, such as space planning (the new University Center in particular) and the university's health insurance policies. As discussed in Chapter 3, it played a crucial role in The New School's leadership issues between December 2008 and January 2009, in the consequent transformation of the Provost's Office in early 2009, and in the student occupation of April 2009. The UFS is broadly responsible for facilitating the sharing of information to the full faculty and, when necessary, convening meetings of the full faculty to consult directly with the deans, provost, president, and trustees.

Currently, the UFS has 30 members. They are elected by faculty within each of the university's seven divisions, with each division designated a specific number of representatives based largely

[20] Organizational charts can be found in Appendix 1.V.
[21] The UFS bylaws can be found in Appendix 1.VIII.

Draft

on the proportion of students enrolled. The UFS includes both full-time and part-time faculty, and typically has three co-chairs who convene one meeting per month. It has both closed and open sessions, with the president and/or provost regularly participating in the latter. The UFS currently has four subcommittees.

The University Student Senate

While some of the university's divisions have had student governance structures, it was only in 2008 that the first university-wide student government body, the University Student Senate (USS), was established. The USS held its first election that year, resulting in the representation of undergraduate and graduate students across all divisions. Elections are held at the end of each academic year in accordance with their constitution, which stipulates the election of representatives by division.[22] Each year, senators elect members to serve on an executive board. Senate subcommittees vary, but have included finance, events, communications, and academics. The USS manages a substantial budget that supports student-driven initiatives.

SECTION IV: POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR GOVERNANCE AND INTEGRITY

The Process for Developing Policies

The New School demonstrates integrity by ensuring that its policies are: (1) developed through consensus building, (2) communicated to the university community in a fluid and transparent fashion, and (3) applied fairly and consistently to students, faculty, staff, and external partners. Because its mission and vision statement asks students and faculty "to understand, contribute to, and succeed in a rapidly changing society, and thus make the world a better and more just place," the application of academic freedom, social justice principles, and transparency should guide academic, student, and employment policies.[23]

The New School has put greater focus on building a more cohesive university over the last decade, and centralized policy development has been critical to these efforts. Drafts are circulated amongst key constituencies to develop consensus on both the content and implementation of new policies, as well as on substantial modifications of existing policies. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, more open and effective governance structures have been put in place to facilitate faculty and student involvement in the development and implementation of major policies. The most important of these structures are the UFS and USS, which allows for university-wide review of academic and administrative policies. The *Full-Time Faculty Handbook* revisions were facilitated by a "green paper/white paper" process (discussed in Chapter 3) and the ongoing implementation of dynamic web-based interactions are designed to ensure an open process of review, comment, and response for all FTF.

With these enhanced governance structures in place, student policies are now developed by key offices that report to Student Services, with input from student representatives. Initial drafts are circulated to most relevant administrative offices, including the Provost's Office and the Office of the General Counsel. Thereafter, more fully developed drafts are circulated to relevant formal

[22] See Appendix 1.IX, or http://www.newschoolsenate.org/about/constitution/
[23] See Appendix 1.X for copies of current policies and their weblinks.

Draft

governance structures for input, such as the Strategic Group or the USS. A final draft is submitted for Board approval. A similar process is replicated for policies specific to faculty (through the Provost's Office) and administrative employees (through Human Resources), as well as university-wide policies. The most recent examples of policies that are a product of this review system are the Academic Integrity Policy, Sexual Assault Policy, revisions of the Sexual & Discriminatory Harassment Policy and related Guidelines, Social Media Policy,[24] and revisions to the *Full-Time Faculty Handbook*.

Communicating of Policies

The regular and routinized process for policy development is only one part of a larger communication strategy. An equally vital component is keeping the community abreast of current policies and practices and providing for easy access, most often on the university's website. All policies and procedures, and other important information, are properly cataloged and placed on the university's public website and the private mynewschool.edu portal, which contains the student and faculty handbooks, as well as the *Institutional Policies & Procedures Manual*.

Policies and procedures regarding student conduct are communicated in several ways: Student policies about honesty and academic integrity are described in the *Student Handbook* and on the Student Rights & Responsibilities' web page. Each new student is issued a handbook and all students are alerted to the availability of an updated handbook each year, which contains references to the Rights and Responsibilities' web page, where more detailed and current information is available. This web page also promotes updates and training on numerous issues each year. Updates include:

- The Code of Conduct, updated April 2008 to clarify expectations
- The Policy of Sexual Assault, adopted and revised October 2008
- More policies adopted in August 2008to support students in crisis
- Enhanced focus on plagiarism, including implementation of a university-wide policy on academic integrity, updated in 2012–2013.

Once a new policy or a significant policy revision is approved by the Board, resources are allocated to the training of the employees who will implement the policy and the education of the university at large regarding the new or changed standards.[25]

Academic Freedom

The New School's core value of academic freedom is safeguarded in the following ways. As with most institutions of higher education, The New School has had a policy promoting and protecting academic freedom for decades. The policy has always been rather broad, so as to accommodate the large number of part-time instructors who make up the majority of The New School's faculty.

[24] University policies can be found in Appendix 1.X.

[25] This sequencing in communication was recently demonstrated with the development and implementation of a Sexual Assault Policy. Once the Board approved the policy, Student Services led the training of all university officials who interface with students. At the same time, the university implemented a "Yes Means Yes" campaign to educate the student body on the new policy.

Draft

Since the last Middle States review, and until the student protests and occupation in 2009, there were few—if any incidents—that would indicate any tensions with the exercise of academic freedom across the campus. This changed, however, when the university sought to discipline students who were alleged to have violated the Code of Conduct while engaging in demonstrations and the occupation of administrative buildings in protest of actions by President Kerrey. These events led to recommendations from a special committee, appointed by the Board of Trustees, that the administration form a working group to include faculty and student representatives to clarify how academic freedom, including the right to demonstrate and protest, was limited by the university's Code of Conduct.[26] These efforts included appropriate consultation with the campus community and, specifically, with the UFS and USS, which resulted in the revision of the Guidelines Regarding Demonstrations.[27] It should be noted that the student takeover of a study center, aligned with the Occupy Wall Street movement described above, did not result in any disciplinary action for demonstrating students or call the policy into question.

The Policy on Conflicts of Interest

Perhaps the most significant institutional policy that directly focuses on integrity is the university's Policy on Conflicts of Interest, which requires that all decisions by members of the Board and university managers be free from improper influences and that those decisions otherwise represent the best interests of the university. This policy applies to all trustees, senior administrators, and designated staff and faculty.

The policy is reviewed and revised as needed each year by the Offices of the General Counsel and Finance and Business Affairs. The process was further modified in fall 2011. Now Human Resources, in consultation with the Office of the General Counsel, disseminates the policy and reviews the responses from designated faculty and staff. The Office of the General Counsel disseminates and analyzes the annual certifications of Board members.

In addition to the Policy on Conflicts of Interest, other university policies require the conduct of students, faculty, and staff to reflect integrity. These include the student and staff Codes of Conduct, the university's Policy on Discriminatory & Sexual Harassment, and the Policy on Academic Integrity. There is also a Whistleblower Policy, which allows community members and members of the public to anonymously report conduct by university officials that lack integrity.

Transparency in Information and Public Representation

The confluence of a heightened regulatory environment, pressures arising from the adverse impact of the economic downturn on the level of enrollments, and the advances in technology and social media have resulted in the devotion of considerable resources to promoting academic programs with a range of channels that include digital, print, and in-person outreach. In using these various media, The New School is committed to ensuring transparency on its academic programs, career outcomes, and graduate student placements.

[26] This was the Committee to Review the Guidelines on Demonstrations in University Facilities.
[27] The Guidelines Regarding Demonstrations can be found in Appendix 1.X.

Draft

More specifically, all institutions of higher education, including The New School, are required to make certain mandatory disclosures and otherwise provide detailed and relevant information so that students can make educated decisions in evaluating The New School's programs and services. This has resulted in the recent and significant revamping of the university's website to ensure that it both contains all required and relevant information and is easily accessible and user-friendly.

In addition, President Van Zandt has prioritized the extent, accuracy, and transparency on how the university collects and analyzes data crucial to strategic decision-making. This scrutiny has led to the revamping and enhancement of the Institutional Research & Effectiveness Department. Other initiatives, such as the data warehousing project, will permit additional transparency in institutional data beginning in late fall 2013. For example, beginning in spring 2012, the university issued a questionnaire on Post-Graduation Activities designed to aggregate graduating students' plans to more effectively and accurately communicate professional outcomes.

Tolerance, Diversity, and Respect

The university's commitment to recruiting and maintaining a diverse faculty and staff is evident in its Affirmative Action Plan,[28] which examines (and takes steps) to rectify under representation among employees and focuses on ensuring that its hiring efforts include the broadest possible outreach to a diverse pool of qualified candidates. Since the last Middle States review, the focus of that commitment has grown to include recruitment and support of students from culturally and socioeconomically diverse backgrounds. While the university has one of the largest populations of international students in the country, and provides academic, administrative, and social support services to ensure that these students thrive throughout their attendance, it is understood that recruiting and retaining students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds is a core characteristic of the university's commitment to social justice.

The New School has housed the Arthur O. Eve Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP) since 1976. Its primary objective is to help provide a range of services to New York State residents to succeed in college regardless of deficits in prior learning. The program has held fast to the ideal that a rich, challenging, and comprehensive education should be available to students from all socioeconomic backgrounds. Retention rates among students in the HEOP program are carefully monitored via a retention chart; this program has had a retention rate above 85 percent for the last six years. It should be noted that average retention rates among first-year HEOP students are slightly lower. This is outlined more fully in Chapter 4, Section III.

The New School's policies and procedures prohibiting discriminatory treatment provide avenues for redress to any member of the university community who believe they have experienced treatment that falls below the university's ideals. Simultaneously, where the university is aware of conduct that it believes violates its standards for integrity and tolerance, it can take myriad actions, including the imposition of discipline. All disciplinary procedures, whether relating to faculty, student, or staff, have attendant grievance procedures.

Beginning in 2009, the Provost's Office constituted a Social Justice Committee, comprised of students, faculty, and staff, to identify areas and issues that require improvement in terms of

[28] The full plan can be found in Appendix 1.XI.

Draft

diversity and the capacity of all students to be equally "at home" at The New School. An Office of Social Justice Initiatives was opened the following year. It has organized a series of campus events and campaigns, a leadership workshop, and sponsored an ongoing survey of "campus climate." A new director was recently hired in August 2013.

The University's Grievance Management System

The university's grievance management system must show both integrity and transparency in order to be effectively used by those challenging adverse actions by the university. Generally, there is separation between academic and nonacademic grievance procedures, including for faculty and, even more particularly, students. For example, each division has policies related to grade appeals and other matters related to student academic progress, whereas violations of the Student Code of Conduct[29] are managed more centrally by the Office of Students Rights & Responsibilities. As mentioned above, in the fall 2012 semester, the university fully implemented a university-wide policy on academic integrity to ensure a more uniform and consistent processing and treatment of academic misconduct by the different schools (see Chapter 3 and Chapter 4).

With regard to faculty, the university has devoted substantial time and resources starting in 2005 to revise and implement policies related to faculty grievance rights. Of the university's approximately 3,000 faculty members, 80 percent are adjuncts whose terms and conditions of employment are governed by one of two collective bargaining agreements (CBAs). The approximately 300 faculty members teaching for The New School for Jazz and Contemporary Music were organized in 1998; the remaining 2,300 PTF are covered by the CBA with ACT-UAW, which went into effect in September 2005. The collective bargaining agreements afford grievance rights related to every facet of an adjunct faculty member's employment, including their initial appointment, reappointment rights, compensation and benefits, leave rights, academic freedom, right to participate in faculty governance, discipline, and termination of employment. There have been dozens of grievances and multiple arbitrations filed since these CBAs went into effect. A similar history and practice apply to the more than 400 unionized administrative employees at The New School. The grievance process for the more than 600 nonunionized administrative employees is more centrally managed through Human Resources.

The grievance rights of the 400 FTF members are set forth in the *Full-Time Faculty Handbook*, which was put into effect in 2006. It was significantly revised in 2010, and revised further in 2013.These revisions all focus on clarifying the categories, privileges, responsibilities, and procedures governing the employment of the full-time faculty. Pursuant to these revisions, divisional grievance committees handle grievance rights related to what are considered "minor issues." Grievances related to "major issues," including those challenging significant discipline (such as suspension, termination, or the decision to deny reappointment and promotion to tenure) are managed by a university-wide grievance committee organized by the UFS, so as to provide consistent and uniform treatment of such issues. Since fall 2010, this committee has processed four grievances related to non-reappointment or the denial of tenure.

[29] The Student Code of Conduct can be found in Appendix 1.XII.

Draft