

NEW SCHOOL UNIVERSITY

SELF-STUDY REPORT

SUBMITTED TO

MIDDLE STATES ASSOCIATION COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

AND

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF ART AND DESIGN

BY

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

FEBRUARY 4, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume I: Self-study Report	PAGE
Foreword	
Introduction and Overview	1
<u>University Reports</u>	
Chapter 1: Mission and Goals	12
Chapter 2: Diversity: Observations, Programs and Recommendations	19
Chapter 3: Teaching and Learning: Resources and Issues	29
Chapter 4: University Learning Resources	43
Chapter 5: Student Services: Student Affairs and Enrollment Services	53
Chapter 6: University Organization and Governance	62
Chapter 7: Budget and Finance	73
Chapter 8: Development and Fund-raising	90
Chapter 9: University Facilities	102
Chapter 10: Outcomes Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness	112
<u>School Reports</u>	
Chapter 11: The New School	121
Chapter 12: Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science	130
Chapter 13: Parsons School of Design	143
Chapter 14: Milano Graduate School of Management and Urban Policy	153
Chapter 15: Eugene Lang College	164
Chapter 16: Mannes College of Music	174
Chapter 17: Actors Studio Drama School	184
Chapter 18: Jazz and Contemporary Music Program	195
Volume II: Appendices	
<u>Guide to the Appendices</u>	
Appendix A: University and School Profiles	
Appendix B: Self-study Steering Committee and Subcommittee Membership	
Appendix C: Liberal Arts Planning	
Appendix D: University Learning Resources	
Appendix E: Student Services	
Appendix F: University Organizational Structure, Committees and University Seminars	
Appendix G: Summary of Corporate and Foundation Giving for Five Years	
Appendix H: University Assessment Plan and School Assessment Plans	
Appendix I: Graduate Faculty Net Cost Comparison	
Appendix J: Parsons School of Design Affiliate Programs	
Appendix K: Mannes College of Music's Extra-curricular and Special Programs	
Appendix L: Research Centers, Publications and Faculty Accomplishments	
Appendix M: Exhibits Available On-site	
Appendix N: President's Action Plan	
Appendix O: Milano Graduate School Faculty Grants	

Appendices—Text

PAGE

B: Self-study Steering Committee and Subcommittee Membership	
B.1 Self-study Steering Committee and Subcommittees	B: 1-5
C: Liberal Arts Planning	
C.1 Liberal Arts Planning 1996-Present	C: 1-2
D: University Learning Resources	
D.1 Summary of Available Learning Resources in the New School University Libraries	D: 1-4
D.2 Distributed Learning at New School University	D: 5-9
D.3 New School University Art Collection	D: 12
E: Student Services	
E.1 Recognized Student Organizations	E: 1
F: University Organizational Structure, Committees and University Seminars	
F.1 New School University Board of Trustees	F: 1-3
F.2 Board of Trustees Committee Membership	F: 4-5
F.3 Boards of Governors	F: 6-7
F.4 University Committees	F: 8
F.5 New School University Seminar Papers	F: 9
H: University Assessment Plan and School Assessment Plans	
H.1 Outcomes Assessment Plan	H: 1-8
J: Parsons School of Design Affiliate Programs	
J.1 Parsons Affiliate Schools	J: 1
K: Mannes College of Music's Extra-curricular and Special Programs	
K.1 Summer Institutes and One-day Programs	K: 1
K.2 Mannes Student Jobs	K: 2
L: Research Centers, Publications and Faculty Accomplishments	
L.1 University Research Centers and Publications	L: 1
L.2 Faculty Publications and Recordings	L: 2-8
M: Exhibits Available On-site	
M.1 Tentative List of Exhibits in the Team Room	M: 1
N: President's Action Plan	
N.1 Becoming New School University—An Action Plan	N: 1-8

Appendices—Figures

A: University and School Profiles	
A.1 Enrollment in Degree and Diploma Programs by School, Fall 2002	A: 13
A.2 Enrollment in Degree Programs and in Adult and Continuing Education Courses, Fall 2002	A: 13
A.3 Enrollment by Full-time and Part-time Status, Fall 2002	A: 14
A.4 International Students in Degree Programs as Percent of Total Enrollment, Fall 2002	A: 14
A.5 Ethnicity of Non-International Students, Fall 2002	A: 15
A.6 Percent of Women by School, Fall 2002	A: 15
A.7 Enrollment in Degree and Diploma Programs & in Non-degree Adult and Continuing Education Courses, Fall 1998-2002	A: 16
A.8 Enrollment Trends in Degree & Diploma Programs by School, Fall 1998-2002	A: 17
D: University Learning Resources	
D.1 Grants & Gifts to NSU Distributed Learning	D: 11
I: Graduate Faculty Net Cost Comparison	
I.1 Estimated Annual Net Cost to Students of Graduate Programs in Social Science	I: 2

Appendices—Tables

PAGE

A: University and School Profiles

A.1	Headcount Enrollment in Degree and Diploma Programs and in Adult and Continuing Education Courses by School, Fall 2002	A: 1
A.2	Headcount Enrollment Trends by School, Fall 1998-2002	A: 2
A.3	Distance Learning (New School Online University), FY 1998-2002	A: 3
A.4	Profile of The New School	A: 4
A.5	Profile of the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science	A: 5
A.6	Profile of Parsons School of Design	A: 6-7
A.7	Profile of the Robert J. Milano Graduate School of Management and Urban Policy	A: 8
A.8	Profile of Eugene Lang College	A: 9
A.9	Profile of Mannes College of Music	A: 10
A.10	Profile of Actors Studio Drama School (M.F.A.)	A: 11
A.11	Profile of Jazz and Contemporary Music Program	A: 12

C: Liberal Arts Planning

C.1	Liberal Arts Planning Committees 2002-03	C: 3
C.2	Liberal Arts Planning Committees 2001-02	C: 4
C.3	Liberal Arts Planning Committees 2000-01	C: 5

D: University Learning Resources

D.1	Growth of Distance Learning Programs	D: 10
D.2	Usage Statistics	D: 10
D.3	NSU Office of Distributed Learning Services Proposed Organization 2003-04	D: 11
D.4	Wireless Access Point Location and Coverage	D: 13-16
D.5	Technology Resources	D: 17-19

E: Student Services

E.1	Student Housing	E: 1
-----	-----------------	------

F: University Organizational Structure, Committees and University Seminars

F.1	Organizational Structure	F: 10
-----	--------------------------	-------

G: Summary of Corporate and Foundation Giving for Five Years

G.1	Top 25 Foundation Donors	G: 1
G.2	Top 25 Corporate Donors	G: 2

H: University Assessment Plan and School Assessment Plans

H.1.1	Assessment of Effectiveness at New School University	H: 9
H.1.2	Albany Outcomes Assessment Model	H: 10
H.1.3	Sample Assessment Plan for Eugene Lang College	H: 11-12
H.2	Profile of New School University Assessment of Effectiveness	H: 13-15
H.3.1	The New School Student Outcome Assessment	H: 16
H.3.2	Graduate Faculty Student Outcomes Assessment	H: 17-19
H.3.3	Parsons School of Design Student Outcomes Assessment	H: 20-21
H.3.4	Milano Graduate School Student Outcomes Assessment	H: 22-23
H.3.5	Eugene Lang College Student Learning Outcomes Template	H: 24-25
H.3.6	Mannes College of Music Student Outcomes Assessment	H: 26-27
H.3.7	Actors Studio Drama School Student Outcomes Assessment	H: 28
H.3.8	Jazz and Contemporary Music Program Student Outcomes Assessment	H: 29-30

I: Graduate Faculty Net Cost Comparison

I.1	Calculation of the Net Costs Incurred by Students Across Graduate Programs	I: 1
-----	--	------

O: Milano Graduate School Faculty Grants

O.1	Robert J. Milano Graduate School—Faculty Grants Awarded 2001-03	O: 1-2
-----	---	--------

FOREWORD

The Self-study Report was produced in preparation for the Middle States Association—National Association of Schools of Art and Design joint evaluation review on April 6-9, 2003. Over 150 faculty members, administrators and students worked in committees and contributed directly to what follows. Their work was guided by two principles: a high degree of inclusion and consultation, and a similar degree of candor.

New School University has a distinctive history in American higher education. While the university has faced many challenges, I wanted the self-study to be both reflective and inspiring to its readers. The history is there, side by side with our most pressing strategic questions.

A thoughtful and direct representation of the university has been produced. Each chapter considers a university topic or is a report of an academic division, concluding with a set of recommendations.

This exercise, ably directed by Deputy Provost Jackson Kytle, engaged the community and a remarkable group of faculty. Professors Bryna Sanger and David Shapiro were faculty co-chairs of the Steering Committee and were generous with both time and wise counsel. The self-study process, punctuated by the arrival of New School's 7th president, Bob Kerrey in January 2001, caused an extraordinary period of institutional self-examination. We asked ourselves, "How are we doing?" on key indicators of academic and institutional quality. The committee went further to ask, "What must we do?" to build on the university's exceptional legacy.

The self-study process and report opened conversations and provoked controversy. It also produced many recommendations for change, some of which have already found their way into the university's policy deliberations.

Elizabeth D. Dickey
Provost

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

There could not have been a more opportune time for a self-study. Founded in 1919 as the New School for Social Research, the institution was first chartered as a university in 1997 to recognize its rapid growth and evolving mission. The entire self-study process, lasting well over three years, has been a wonderful opportunity to raise important questions now before the university as a whole as well as before each of its eight schools and colleges. To introduce the self-study, we use the opening paragraphs to set the context, to describe the university past and present and to call attention to important themes that figure prominently in chapters ahead.¹

New York City and New School share certain features and a common future. Just as the totality of New York City seems difficult to grasp, New School is not a simple institution, either in terms of its history or present structure. The university *qua* university is not always understood by people outside whose impressions date to the founding colleges, the New School for Social Research and the Graduate Faculty, unless a special relationship exists to a school like Mannes, previously independent with a distinguished history. The connection of school to university may appear forced, and for this reason, a source of confusion, if not conflict.

People inside the institution also may not grasp the whole, which has changed dramatically. One major change has been the addition of significant—and growing—enrollment in new colleges for the performing arts and design like Mannes, Jazz and especially Parsons, a fact that has raised important questions about connections to our founding colleges, the university’s mission and its traditional focus on liberal arts. The Self-study Report will demonstrate, if nothing else, that the schools and colleges have different academic cultures, varying greatly in size, mission and degree of maturation as academic communities. Parsons, for example, is a large school with many academic programs and a long history of its own, particularly in comparison to new and far smaller divisions like Jazz or the Actors Studio.

The second change is one of scale. The challenge of providing academic and student services to more than 7,000 degree candidates in eight academic colleges that offer diverse programs and degrees, from pre-college to the doctorate, is great. Because university and school plans project enrollment growth to over 9,000 students by 2007, that challenge will only increase.

¹ For this report, the term “New School” will serve as shorthand for New School University much like Columbia connotes Columbia University. When referring to the founding division, the correct form is The New School. To ease the burden on readers, we try to avoid acronyms and use short forms of address for the eight schools and colleges except if that reference is not clear: The New School, Graduate Faculty, Milano, Mannes, Parsons, Lang, Actors Studio, and Jazz.

The complexity of the "new" New School provokes its most vital questions: mission and organizational identity; academic quality and evidence of learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness; the right ratio of full to part-time faculty; the relationship of the schools to the university; an appropriate mix of liberal arts, design, performing arts and professional studies; cost-effective provision of administrative services; university management and faculty governance; and lastly, how institutional conflict over means and ends will be managed. These questions and many others raised by the Self-study Steering Committee were put to the subcommittees studying university topics and individual schools. The self-study involved more than 150 of the institutions' lead faculty, senior staff and officers (see Appendix B).

Mission reviews were required of each school and the university. Revised mission statements are featured in: *Volume I: Self-study Report*, *Volume II: Appendices* and *Volume III: Academic Plans*. (*Volume III* is available to the team as an exhibit and is not directly discussed here).² While these several products are useful, the self-study's most important results are more intangible than the questions and answers laid out in the report, its appendices and the exhibits being organized. The Self-study Steering Committee believes the self-study has increased communication and built trust among the many constituencies of this fast-evolving, urban university. As the process unfolded, we discerned a need to describe ourselves to one another as much as to external audiences.

Brief History³

The history of the institution can be seen in three periods. While the depiction below is succinct, more detail is offered than might be true of conventional self-studies. We do so in the spirit of communicating with a dispersed university community whose members may not know this history and the values that have played so prominent a role in that history, or who are themselves too new to the institution to have witnessed important changes.

Foundations: 1919-1969. Free speech, intellectual discourse and progressive thought mattered from the start. In 1919 the New School for Social Research (known as the New School) was founded by progressive intellectuals of the day who resented the heavy-handed way the Columbia University administration had responded to campus dissent regarding World War I and the draft. Among the founding faculty were: Thorstein Veblen, Wesley Mitchell and Leo Wolman (economics), Emily Putnam (classics), Charles Beard and James Robinson (history), Alexander Goldenweiser (anthropology), Horace Kallen (philosophy) and Henry Dana (literary

² The university has several planning documents: *Five-Year Plans* that respond to the new budget rules, *Academic Plans* produced alongside the self-study, a detailed Strategic Plan produced by Parsons and the *Master Capital Plan* regarding facilities. All are available to the evaluation team as exhibits.

³ Adapted from published histories: Peter Rutkoff and William Scott, *New School: A History of the New School for Social Research* (New York: The Free Press, 1986); Claus-Dieter Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile*, trans. Rita and Robert Kimber (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1993). Other sources: Jonathan Fanton, *The University and Civil Society* (New York: New School for Social Research, 1995) and university publications.

criticism). John Dewey, philosopher, public intellectual and the father of progressive education, later returned to Columbia. That first spring an “education for educated adults” was offered to some 200 students at 465 West 23rd Street, a site abandoned in 1930 for the present location in Greenwich Village.

In 1933 the storied "University in Exile" was created, renamed the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science in 1938. This faculty was so named for offering refuge to European intellectuals fleeing fascism in Europe. In the first wave, 89 leading European intellectuals were invited and 52 came to the United States. With support from the Rockefeller Foundation, President Alvin Johnson brought 34 to New School (compared to three to Columbia, two to Yale, and none to Harvard). One each went to nine other universities, the others to research institutions. By the mid 1940s, a total of 184 émigré scholars came to New School alone, adding intellectual and moral heft to a young institution. Among them were Emil Lederer, Adolph Lowe, Bronislaw Malinowski, Alfred Schütz, Hans Speier, Leo Strauss and Max Wertheimer. In 1942 the New School supported the *Ecole Libre des Hautes Etudes*, a temporary home for renowned scholars like Claude Levi-Strauss and Jacques Maritain. To this day, the extraordinary moral courage shown by the leaders of the New School for Social Research, a new institution without major financial resources of its own, remains alive in the minds of the faculty, staff and those students who learn of our history.

The arts were important early on. Jose Clemente Orozco in 1931 contributed his unique contemporary art murals, as did Thomas Hart Benton. In 1934, editor Gorham Munson launched the Writing Workshops. In the early 1940s Martha Graham taught dance; Berenice Abbott, photography; Aaron Copland, music; and Frank Lloyd Wright, architecture. In 1940 President Johnson invited Erwin Piscator, former director of the Berlin *Volkstheater*, to build a department of dramatic arts. Writing, dance, music and the theater have been curricular staples ever since.

Social issues remained central to the institution’s ethos, which attracted teachers such as W.E.B. Dubois, Katherine Dunham and Thurgood Marshall. In 1933 President Johnson created the General Seminar and founded the interdisciplinary journal, *Social Research*, which published the seminar’s work in English. In 1951 the Human Relations Center became the nation's first daytime program of studies for mature women. It is now called the Vera List Center, after a former student at the Center and long-term benefactor, recently deceased.

Lecturers of the 1950s in the New School’s Adult Division continued progressive traditions. Historians Rutkoff and Scott cite many names from that period, including artists Bernice Abbott and Peggy Bacon, art historian Meyer Schapiro, political commentator Max Lerner, socialist advocate Norman Thomas, theologian Reinhold Niebuhr, philosopher Ernest Nagel, psychologists Karen Horney and Erich Fromm, and Hannah Arendt, who came to the Graduate Faculty in 1967. She joined Hans Jonas, whom she first met in 1924 when they were philosophy students in Heidegger’s seminar at Marburg.

To an uncommon degree, free speech, social justice, innovation and education for adults inform debates heard on the campus today. These founding values continue to attract independent-minded and creative people who join the university to build upon ethical commitments of long standing. They come to a fully recognized establishment: In 1941 the maturing institution was chartered by New York State Board of Regents, and in 1959 it received accreditation by the Middle States Association. Professional accreditations, such as the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), which first accredited Parsons in 1966, the American Psychological Association (APA) and others, have been added since.

Growth, Diversification and Financial Stability: 1970 to 1997. At 50 years old, the New School for Social Research entered a period of enrollment growth, expanding its mission and, early in the period, increasing financial instability. After stabilization, program diversification in the arts continued. The addition of independent institutions like Parsons and Mannes as well as collaborative programs with the Actors Studio considerably enhanced the academic reputation of the institution but also brought new challenges.

The most important decision was the acquisition of Parsons School of Design in 1970, upon whose fortunes the university today is so dependent. Parsons brought a 75-year history of its own along with financial distress. The New School leaders of that era believed they could rebuild Parsons while diversifying New School enrollment. In 1975 the Graduate School of Management and Urban Policy (later renamed the Milano School) was created to educate leaders for government service and urban policy analysis, nonprofit organizations and business, human resources and health services. In 1978 the Seminar College (renamed Eugene Lang College in 1985) was created, becoming New School's first full-time, four-year undergraduate liberal arts college. Then as now, it featured small seminars and interdisciplinary study.

President Jonathon Fanton, the sixth president, arrived in 1982 from the University of Chicago. He had two goals: to restore financial stability and to renew the academic mission. In particular, he sought to strengthen the Graduate Faculty, expand study opportunities in East and Central Europe and South Africa, and rejuvenate arts education.

The Jazz program was founded in 1986 at Parsons. Mannes College of Music, founded in 1916, was added in 1989. (Like Parsons, Mannes was in financial distress.) External funding was secured in 1994 from the Fund for the Improvement for Postsecondary Education to create DIAL, the university's online learning service, now known as New School Online University, or NSOU. Finally, the Actors Studio Drama School was created in 1995 in collaboration with the renowned Actors Studio.

The addition of Parsons and Mannes, in particular, brought significant and perhaps unanticipated changes: the number of full-time undergraduates grew in the overall enrollment mix and the number of international students dramatically increased. Both changes raised significant questions around university student services and support for foreign students, who in 2002 constituted 22% of all degree students.

In 1993-94, the University Diversity Initiative began and continues to the present. As we describe later, the Initiative is a coordinated and centralized set of resources and programs to increase representation of minority groups in every facet of university life and to demonstrate intellectual and cultural diversity in every aspect of the education offered to students.

Under President Fanton's aegis, the university launched its first Capital Campaign, which raised \$200 million. The increase in fund-raising—much of it thanks to trustee generosity—along with enrollment growth and careful financial controls instituted by the board and administration strengthened the university's finances progressively. The most recent and independent recognition of the university's improved financial condition was the decision by Moody's in spring 2001 to raise the university's bond rating to A3 from Baa1. Funds from all sources made possible annual investments in the university's people and programs. They also enabled the university to increase the endowment and to create budgetary reserves to support borrowing for major projects. Improvements funded included appointments of new full-time faculty, increases in student scholarships, facilities acquisitions and renovations, and the creation of the university's information technology infrastructure.

Presidential Transition and Search for University Identity: 1997-present. President Bob Kerrey was appointed in 2001. He introduced an open style of management, organized around principles of budget transparency and delegation of authority. Decentralization had begun to fade in the Fanton years as the university took over more and more responsibilities. The management plan under Kerrey is a mixed model: the eight schools and colleges are responsible for academic programs and advising, while the university is responsible for strategic planning, enrollment management, housing, student services, libraries and information technology, human resources, and most finance and business functions. Institutional development, so critical for the university's future, is a mix of centralized and decentralized elements. In general, the modifications in organization and management philosophy have produced profound changes and sharp debate regarding the university's organization plan and the definition of *all* institutional roles: dean, officer, university trustee and school governor and the faculty, both as a university body and for the larger schools. The changes have sometimes been difficult for individual schools that felt their autonomy threatened by a university just finding its way.

The university's leadership has used the self-study to understand the strengths and accomplishments that the university has realized in recent years, and to assess new challenges in a candid, balanced manner. Improvements suggested along the way—notably, regularizing faculty appointments and making changes to academic policies—have been implemented or assigned to appropriate committees. One improvement, discussed under Outcomes Assessment and Institutional Assessment, is the new administration's increasing focus on empirical assessment and the use of data for policy decisions. New School now produces fact books; participates in national studies like the National Survey of Student Engagement; conducts regular studies of student satisfaction, student achievement, library use; and has a president who asks policies to be based, where possible, on empirical data.

At several points over the last year, the president has challenged fundamental premises about the university, from its budget rules to the language used to describe the missions of the university and each of its schools. He has asked the university to increase its quality and stature and to move from being a “good institution to a great university”—with all the changes to fundraising strategy, management priorities and academic investments that phrase involves.

Meanwhile, the academic renewal that began under President Fanton continues. Ongoing academic initiatives by the Office of the Provost, described in detail in the narrative or available as Exhibits, include strengthening undergraduate education, particularly in the liberal arts; improving undergraduate writing; developing new programs in environmental studies and humanities; revising academic policies, especially those pertaining to faculty hiring and evaluation; and revitalizing university libraries.

New School University in 2003

In 1997, in order to acknowledge the reality of an organization far more complex than its progressive founders ever imagined, the university was chartered. New School University offers programs of study, credit and noncredit, at all degree levels through the doctorate. The collegiate system is organized in eight schools and colleges, each with its own history, academic culture and curricula. These include The New School (1919), the Graduate Faculty (1933), Parsons School of Design (1896/1970), Milano Graduate School of Management and Urban Policy (1975), Eugene Lang College (1985), the Jazz and Contemporary Music Program (1986), Mannes College of Music (1916/1989), and the Actors Studio Drama School (1995). In addition, the university supports 14 policy institutes; numerous academic conferences, musical and theatrical performances, and art shows every year; and two renowned journals, *Social Research* and *World Policy Journal*, among other scholarly publications. Academic programs are accredited by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), the American Psychological Association (APA), the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), and the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB). New School University degrees and certificates are registered in the State of New York and the District of Columbia (one small program at Parsons).

The university’s 2002-03 operating budget is \$164 million, the endowment is over \$100 million and the university employs 2,600 people. Fifty-five percent of students seeking a degree are undergraduates, with the rest enrolled in masters and doctoral programs. In fall 2002, the university enrolled over 7,547 degree candidates, 77 percent studying full time, and more than 9,890 continuing education students. Degree enrollment has been growing steadily even as continuing education enrollment has declined sharply, with some evidence this fall of improvement. The largest degree enrollment is found at Parsons School of Design (2,958 degree students) and The New School (1,292), and the smallest is for MFA students at the Actors Studio Drama School (210). Parsons, The New School and Lang College (637) are the fastest growing schools, and university plans project these trends to continue. Jazz, Graduate Faculty, Mannes, Actors Studio and Milano are not projected to grow (see university and school profiles in Appendix A and *Fact Book 2002*).

New School University and its City

The identity of New School—its ideals and values, people and evolution—is inseparable from New York City, Manhattan and the historic neighborhood of Greenwich Village. There is the special energy of a great city and easy access to talent and dynamic institutions in finance, media, social policy, art and culture. New School is able to attract as its teachers talented men and women from every profession. Drawn to the excitement of New York City and its opportunities, real and imagined, millions of young people in successive generations come to the city for an education and their first job. New School’s downtown campus is located in a nexus of public transportation, including several subway lines and the PATH from New Jersey.

New York is a city of immigrants and immigration patterns are changing. For more than three hundred years, New York has been the port of entry to the United States to which many millions have come in search of a better life. New York is also an international city with close connections, especially, to Europe and the dynamics of that continent. More recently, the city and the university benefit from so-called “new Americans” from Latin America, Africa, East Asia and Asia. In an age when most people for the first time live in cities, New York City is one of the world’s largest and most dynamic cities, and recent census data show it, in fact, to be the world’s most ethnically diverse city. Because diversity is so important to the institution’s future, this topic has a chapter of its own.

The special relationship between the city and the university is nowhere more evident than in matters of space. Finding good space in this crowded, expensive locale can be more difficult than finding good students. The immense, diverse and fast-changing urban population, now greater than 10 million, makes recruiting students less challenging than it is for many American colleges and universities. The harder task is real estate. Having to work with the world's most expensive real estate forces difficult budget choices, which are described from different perspectives in several chapters including Teaching and Learning, Learning Resources and University Facilities.

Mission of New School University

Prior to this review, the university did not have a formal statement of mission and those for several colleges were dated. As the first chapter—Mission and Goals—describes, conversations and debates about purpose are essential for an institution for which values have figured so importantly. The university mission statement that follows was developed over many months by the Self-study Steering Committee and has been discussed in many university forums by the officers, deans and faculties as well as approved formally by the trustees. |

UNIVERSITY MISSION

Intellectual freedom, artistic and academic excellence, and social responsibility are the guiding values of New School University, a progressive New York institution. Its schools and colleges for design, liberal arts, performing arts, social sciences and public policy challenge students to develop the capacity, passion and will to strengthen the communities and world in which they live.

Concurrent to the self-study was a mission review in which each of the schools reviewed drafts of mission statements as well as goals and objectives. Drafts were reviewed by the schools and important governing bodies, by the Steering Committee, and by formal bodies in the university like trustees. The Steering Committee and the university and school administrations went to great lengths to involve as many people as possible in public conversations about values, first purposes and goals. We count those conversations and the sense of community they build as important as the text they yield, if not more so.

Becoming a University

The Self-study Report will argue that New School University enjoys many advantages: the moral commitments of its founding colleges; being located in a vibrant neighborhood in the world's most diverse city; notable faculties in the performing arts, design, urban policy and social research; generous trustees; and more than twenty years of balanced budgets. Both the university and its city have shown great resilience to the economic threat and demoralization of the September 11 attacks, just two miles from main campus. The university's response points to one of our most important assets: the loyalty of New School faculty and staff who are selfless when it comes to helping the institution.

For all its assets and accomplishments, one overarching challenge is inescapable: to become a university in more than name. Created in 1997, the university as a whole has not achieved a coherent identity, especially in comparison to the visibility and loyalty given some of its individual colleges. Academic programs are not well coordinated across colleges, resulting in inefficient use of facilities and added costs to operate in what is already one of the world's most expensive cities. Despite recent progress, investments in full-time faculty, research and new program development have been hard to fund. Good progress over the last ten years in areas like student housing, human resources and hiring full-time faculty has brought a new challenge: heightened expectations for further investment and still more progress.

New School University intends to improve its academic quality, strengthen student writing and critical thinking, include the voice of faculty and staff in governance, and develop new services for students. In order for New School University to transform itself from a good institution to a great university—a vibrant institution celebrated for its graduates, artistic creations, social research and public service—it must develop a coherent identity, agree on its goals and provide cost-effective administrative services. Increasingly, the academic leadership

understands the need to assess learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness, using empirical studies to check assumptions. That awareness must penetrate the academic cultures of all schools, and the university must insist that quality is measured where possible.

Certain dialectics emerged during the self-study, especially over the last two years, and it would not be the New School if we didn't use such terms. Each dialectic figures prominently in the report and in debates one hears today on campus about the kind of place the institution is becoming and the extent to which founding values like free speech influence the multifaceted, modern institution now emerging. First, the most visible tension is between a *managerial focus* and an *academic focus* in institutional administration. That tension is common in higher education, especially in large universities. Still, the growing complexity of the university as well as the provision of centralized services like housing, admissions and student services has required a managerial focus that has not always been in balance, in the eyes of some, with the academic focus of a university whose colleges have important histories and special missions.

The second dialectic is the tension between the university as a *teaching institution* and as a *research institution*, which connects to important topics we discuss later like faculty roles and rewards, and faculty development. Again, most colleges and universities face this challenge. For most of its history, New School has focused on teaching, with the exception of the Graduate Faculty and Milano. But that emphasis is changing in ways described in the chapter on Teaching and Learning. For The New School, Parsons and Lang, this tension has been exacerbated by the third dialectic, described next.

The third dialectic exists between *the liberal arts* in curricula at Eugene Lang College and the two founding schools, the Graduate Faculty and The New School, and *the applied arts*, for want of a better term, in the conservatories for music and acting (Mannes, Jazz, Actors Studio) and the two *professional* schools (Parsons and Milano). Even this characterization is awkward because the university is still searching for the best terms with which to describe itself. This dialectic is the most difficult and, arguably, the most important for the university's future. After all, the debate heard on campus today between "the liberal arts" and "the arts and design" is not just an academic diversion—the way the liberal arts are organized in the emerging university, especially for undergraduate studies, defines the institution's academic vision and its search for quality. Real connections, too, exist between this dialectic and university and school missions, corporate identity and institutional priorities for investment. As with our other dialectics, two final points are important: the differences between the categories in the dialectic can be exaggerated and the institution could miss the fact that both parts of the university have much to contribute to the other.

Finally, the Self-study Report will demonstrate that the expansion and diversification of the 1970s-1990s together with fiscal controls brought financial stability even as growing size and complexity introduced challenges of mission coherence and setting priorities for a much-changed institution. While one could always question strategic moves, none of these changes would have been possible without the ethical and academic ethos of the founding schools as well as the hard-won financial base that the university now enjoys. Tens of thousands of students have benefited, as have the city and local communities around the globe to which New School graduates return with idealism for change, new concepts and fresh skills. The Self-study Report will suggest that the responsibility falls to the current generation of trustees,

administrators, teachers, staff and students, first, to understand the challenge to make a university from all its many parts, and second, to negotiate in good faith the inevitable tensions and rising expectations occasioned by the community's resolve to improve itself.

Academic Planning

A brief update on the status of liberal arts planning may assist the evaluation team, and several appendices and exhibits will be important to consult. As Chapter 3 on Teaching and Learning suggests, serious academic questions are being debated as of this writing, partly stimulated by the self-study. Much of the planning has been underway for two years and self-study recommendations have been folded into subcommittee charges as well as into the President's Action Plan (see Appendix N). As Appendix C documents, this year the Provost charged a number of university committees to evaluate undergraduate liberal arts and university academic policies. Topics include: the idea of an integrated curriculum; the plan for a new Humanities Center; the desirability of having required university core courses and if so, in what areas; the organizational plan to support those courses; funding strategy for joint appointments to allow the university to hire distinguished faculty; and tenure for such faculty appointments made outside the Graduate Faculty. All these vital matters will not be resolved quickly or easily, to be sure, but we do expect the strategic direction to be settled shortly.

Choice of Study Design

Three reasons led the administration to propose an *alternative study model*: first, the university's complexity; second, the decentralized nature of our academic colleges; and third, the special needs of the fast-growing university as a developing institution. The alternative study model will, in fact, be a blend of a comprehensive study and individual reports on academic matters from the schools and colleges. As the self-study design proposes, the subcommittee for each school received a general set of questions as well as specific questions appropriate to the school. Although the design is unusual, commission standards will be addressed.

Modifications to the approved lineup of topics proved necessary. We requested and received permission from MSCHE staff to eliminate the special focus chapters, merging those topics into other chapters. Learning resources is treated as a separate chapter, but not as a special topic. During the course of last year, the leadership of the university's admissions office was changed. This made it difficult to adequately address enrollment management. That topic is given limited coverage under Student Services and Enrollment Management because admissions and financial aid now report in this way.

Finally, the self-study design will support a joint visit between MSCHE and the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), which accredits academic programs at Parsons School of Design.

Organization of the Self-study Steering Committee and Subcommittees

Membership of the Self-study Steering Committee included broad representation of faculty and staff members from all schools and major offices. At the request of the provost, special efforts were made to place faculty in leadership positions. Two senior members of the faculty, Professors Bryna Sanger and David Shapiro, were co-chairs until June 2001 when Dr. Sanger went on leave for that year (she has returned). A smaller group, the Coordinating Committee, coordinated the work of the Steering Committee and consisted of Provost Elizabeth Dickey; Professors Sanger and Shapiro; Deputy Provost Jackson Kytly; Dr. Marianthi Zikopoulos, Director of Institutional Research; Amos Himmelstein, Chief of Staff; and Aimee Silverman, Assistant to the Deputy Provost.

Subcommittees that worked on university topics were selected to achieve the following aims: to represent diverse opinion, to increase faculty participation, to get expert opinion, and to introduce a new generation to the self-study process. The school subcommittees were selected and charges given to each group (see Appendix B). Where possible, students were named to the subcommittees, but membership changed frequently. In divisions like Lang College and the Graduate Faculty, student participation was more consistent than for most subcommittees.

Numerous means were used to ensure the broadest possible inclusion, both for the university as a whole, at all levels through the trustees, and for individual schools. Mechanisms for involvement varied, especially by school. Lang College, for example, created an elaborate set of focus groups for its self-study. Where possible, we relied upon existing governance groups. As drafts emerged from a subcommittee, individuals and groups vetted them. Community feedback forums were held in the fall and the self-study drafts were posted on the provost's web page (as was the Self-study Design).

It is not easy for a self-study to balance description and analysis, self-promotion and self-criticism. Done right, it should focus on critique more than affirmation. Readers of the final draft were concerned that the narrative is too severe as if there were more things wrong than right. A few readers hoped for more analysis. The Steering Committee has reached for balance *and* candor, and trusts the reader understands our motive to ask as many hard questions as one can by way of stimulating institutional pride and motivating change.

A closing word about authorship is needed. The reports ahead do not identify the writers. Subcommittee chairs usually, but not exclusively, organized and submitted the work of the subcommittee, which included writing, and were the authors in that sense. Final drafts were read by senior officers, a copy editor and approved by the Steering Committee, before being submitted to university governance bodies.