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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The New School is a distinguished, progressive university situated in the heart of New York City’s Greenwich Village. The university strives to train world citizens; individuals whose ideas and innovations forge new paths of progress in the arts, design, humanities, public policy, and the social sciences. In addition to its 92 graduate and undergraduate degree-granting programs and majors, the university offers non-credit certificate programs and more than 650 continuing education courses. In many ways, The New School is a deeply transformed institution since the last Self-Study in 2003. The past decade has been marked by growth in students, full-time faculty, range of academic programs, collaborations across academic units, facilities and physical plant, and financial resources. Unfortunately, increased tensions and discontent between various key constituencies of the university also accompanied this period of rapid growth. However, these "growing pains" brought important changes to the university’s governance, including a deeper engagement of the Board of Trustees, a strengthened Provost’s Office, and an institutional commitment to greater transparency and participation in planning and decision-making.

On January 1, 2011, David Van Zandt, former Dean of the School of Law at Northwestern University, became the eighth President of the New School. He succeeded Bob Kerrey, who had served as The New School’s president for ten years. The Comprehensive Self-Study design was selected in part because it provided an ideal opportunity for the new president and his administration to take stock of the achievements of the last ten years while identifying and prioritizing goals and objectives for the future.

The self-study is arranged into six thematic chapters that collectively address the fourteen standards of excellence. The process for producing the Self-Study was overseen by a Steering Committee comprised of New School faculty, administrators, students, and Trustees. The composition of the committee, co-chaired by a faculty member and a senior member of the Provost Office, emerged out of discussions among co-chairs, deans, officers, the Provost, and the President. In consultation with the Provost, the Steering Committee co-chairs constituted and charged six working groups with responsibility for developing the six chapters of the Self-Study. Each working group was asked to examine and research the university’s strengths and weaknesses in relation to one or more of the fourteen MSCHE Standards of Excellence. With the exception of the Faculty Working Group, the working groups were co-chaired by a faculty member and a senior administrator, both of whom served on the Steering Committee. Other members of the Steering committee included two Trustees, a representative from the Faculty and Student Senates, and four at-large members: one dean, vice-president, student, and faculty member.

The specific goals and objectives for the self-study, as stated in the self-study design, were:

- To identify our strengths and weaknesses in relation to the MSCHE accreditation standards and to make recommendations for future resource allocation decisions.
- To catalog, catalyze and inform the relatively new university-wide strategic planning effort, thereby advancing our capacity for evidence-based planning and decision-making.
- To catalog and reinforce the ongoing institutionalization and systematization of various university-wide processes and activities at The New School, including institutional assessment.
• To promote and enhance community building through the involvement of the university’s stakeholders in all aspects of the self-study process, including the critical examination of the university’s mission, goals, policies and procedures, facilities, educational offerings, resources, student services, admissions policies, teaching and research practices.

The self-study documents the university’s many strengths and achievements over the last decade, several of which have been transformational. These achievements have included the development of university-wide spaces, programs, policies and procedures in addition to the increased collaboration across academic programs. The most tangible of these developments is the newly constructed University Center (UC), which provides academic and performance space, student dormitories, and a new home for the library. The UC is the first New School space designed to be utilized by the entire university. Equally important, tenure for all full-time faculty was introduced across the university coinciding with the regularizing of faculty status, rank and evaluation procedures across the divisions and codified in the Full-Time Faculty Handbook. Lastly, fragmented, division-centric planning processes have been supplanted by a newly adopted university-wide Strategic Plan, coupled with an updated Mission Statement.

The self-study also identifies a number of challenges that confront the university as it moves forward in pursuit of its strategic goals and objectives. Many of these challenges reflect the university’s history as a collection of relatively autonomous divisions unaccustomed to the type of coordinated, university-wide decision making, planning and assessment that is typical of a fully integrated academic institution. The members of the working groups, as well as various constituencies from the broader community, vigorously examined these issues throughout the self-study process. The results of these deliberations appear in the self-study in the form of a list of concrete recommendations for addressing many of the challenges facing The New School. Importantly, the recommendations are consistent with the values, strategic priorities and fiscal realities of the university. What follows is a brief summary of the key findings from each of the six chapters, including the recommendations.

Chapter 1: Vision and Leadership. This chapter addresses three MSCHE standards: Mission and Goals (Standard 1), Leadership and Governance (Standard 4), and Integrity (Standard 6). The chapter chronicles the formation of a coherent academic mission and vision for the university, and documents The New School’s progression from a loose confederacy of academic units to a more integrated institution; a transition that is still a work-in-progress. Two important benchmarks of this integration process are discussed. The first is the May 2013 Board of Trustees approval of the first formally adopted university-wide mission and vision statements. The statements articulate The New School’s core principles and priorities based on curricular strengths in design and the social sciences, promote a distinct focus on creativity and innovation, and emphasize civic and public engagement with both a New York City focus and a global orientation. The other benchmark is the approval by the Board of Trustees of the New School’s first university-wide strategic plan.

The many related changes in the university’s leadership and governance structures since the 2003 self-study are also detailed in this chapter, as is the ongoing effort to engage in a planning process informed by a singular university vision. Lastly, the chapter examines how, and to what degree, the university acts, and is perceived as acting, with the integrity required to advance its mission.
through the promotion of academic freedom, transparency, and trust within the institution and between it and its publics.

In terms of improvements, this chapter includes two recommendations: (1) Implement an assessment process for the Board as a body and formalize the assessment of board members during their renewal process; and (2) Develop a process for the periodic re-evaluation of the mission statement and the strategic plan.

Chapter 2: Resources and Infrastructure. This chapter addresses three standards: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal (Standard 2); Institutional Resources (Standard 3); and Administration (Standard 5). It critically examines the structures, processes, and resources (financial, spatial, technical, learning, and human) that support strategic priority setting, planning, and implementation in the service of The New School’s mission.

The challenges associated with a revenue model in which tuition and fees account for 90 percent of revenue are examined in detail. Dramatic enrollment growth, assisted by some fundraising throughout the 2000s, provided revenues sufficient to increase the hiring of full-time faculty and to develop a new physical plant, but quickly proved to be unsustainable. This was confirmed with the enrollment downturn of 2011–2012 and 2012–2013, which created significant budget shortfalls and highlighted the urgency to address the university’s financial model. In this regard the chapter outlines how the new institutional planning processes encompass the dual goals of maintaining and enhancing academic quality, while requiring constant innovation to develop programs that attract the types and numbers of students that best fit the university and its mission. This, as outlined in the Strategic Plan, is deemed critical for maintaining program and enrollment profiles that support the financial base of the university.

This chapter includes two recommendations: (1) Create an iterative annual budget process that coordinates planning and resource allocation to increase efficiencies and reinforce University wide initiatives, goals, and the strategic plan. Additionally, create a related process to address needs for additional funding throughout the year; and (2) Divisions and administrative units should reevaluate and reconcile their own strategic planning efforts with the newly adopted University strategic plan.

Chapter 3: Faculty. This chapter addresses the standard on Faculty (Standard 10) and begins from the premise that The New School’s faculty is at the center of our educational achievements and academic aspirations and critical to fulfilling the goals of the newly adopted strategic plan, particularly with regard to Student and Academic Success. It is noted that in the years since the last self-study, four interconnected developments have been particularly transformative: the formation of the University-wide Faculty Senate; a collective bargaining agreement with the now unionized part-time Faculty; a new Full-Time Faculty Handbook that (among many changes) regularized employment categories and introduced the possibility of tenure across the university; and a large growth in the number of full-time faculty.

With regard to improvement needs, this chapter includes one recommendation: Assess and improve the utilization and effectiveness of current resources for supporting professional growth and advancement of faculty, particularly with regard to the mentoring of junior faculty.
Chapter 4: Students. This chapter addresses two standards: Student Admissions and Retention (Standard 8) and Student Support Services (Standard 9). It describes the resources, policies, and procedures currently employed by the university to recruit, retain, and support its student body, and to ensure that the profiles of admitted students are consistent with its mission and vision statement. It also documents the methods by which student-directed services are strategically and selectively deployed to maximize student success at various points along the admission-to-graduation sequence.

The New School continues to enroll a highly international student body and maintains the distinction of having one of the most international student bodies in the country. Additionally, there is a healthy level of economic diversity in the undergraduate divisions as well, but it is acknowledged that student funding, particularly for graduate students, remains a concern. Changes that occurred in the last decade in admissions practices and student services are also addressed, particularly in light of the 29 percent increase in total credit-seeking enrollments between 2002 and 2012.

This chapter includes one recommendation: Conduct a comprehensive assessment of student support services, especially for international students, with a view to improving effective integration of support systems to improve student success.

Chapter 5: Programs and Curriculum. This chapter addresses three standards: Educational Offerings (Standard 11); General Education (Standard 12); and Related Educational Activities (Standard 13). It describes the breadth, depth, and quality of our educational offerings, and examines how the university connects its offerings with student learning goals and objectives. The chapter also examines how the university seeks to support and advance the quality and rigor of its offerings through growth in the size of the full-time faculty; revision of existing programs; the addition of new programs; and through interdisciplinary learning, teaching, and scholarship that emphasize creativity, civic engagement, project-based learning, and distributed education.

An important element in this chapter is a discussion of the history of general education at The New School, particularly in relation to the Shared Capacities initiative. The initiative has been conceptualized as a vehicle for accomplishing the goals of general education and more, but in a way that is ecologically consonant with the pedagogical needs and objectives of the diverse programs of the university.

This chapter includes one recommendation with respect to improvement: Systematically integrate the five general education proficiencies into the Shared Capacities Initiative with focus on improving quantitative/scientific reasoning.

Chapter 6: Assessment. This chapter addresses two standards: Institutional Assessment (Standard 7) and Assessment of Student Learning (Standard 14). It highlights the fact that a comprehensive, systematic assessment of institutional effectiveness at The New School is a relatively new enterprise that is still a work in progress. However, the university has made significant strides over the last three years in building a durable and sustainable institutional assessment infrastructure. Moreover, with the formal adoption of the university’s newly articulated strategic plan, coupled with a revitalized and better resourced Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE) office, the
university is now positioned to ensure that all future institutional planning and decision-making is
guided by a robust assessment of institutional effectiveness at all levels.

In terms of student learning outcomes assessment, the chapter examines past practices of
assessment, which have mostly been informal and indirect, and current university-wide efforts to
formalize assessment through direct evidence in ways that are consonant with our mission. Also
detailed are ongoing and planned improvements in institutional assessment that will occur over the
next five years.

This chapter includes four inter-related recommendations that are largely reflected in the five-year
assessment plan discussed in the body of the chapter: (1) Enhance the sustainability of the current
student learning outcomes assessment cycle and promote greater use of learning outcomes to
evaluate and improve the assessment of student learning through ongoing identification of
learning outcomes and benchmarks; (2) Improve the systematic use of institutional and program
level assessment results to inform planning, resource allocation and programmatic improvement;
(3) Develop and implement metrics, key performance indicators and benchmarks for the
assessment of the strategic goals; and (4) Develop formal policy and procedures for the sharing of
assessment information to both internal and external stakeholders.
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PREAMBLE TO THE SELF-STUDY

INTRODUCTION

The New School is a private research university located in New York City. Founded in 1919 as a nondegree granting institution principally serving an adult population, The New School is both an atypical and essential part of the American and international higher education landscape. Beyond its origins as a school for nontraditional populations, it internationalized in 1933 by providing a home for scholars fleeing fascism in interwar Europe. The University in Exile became the basis for the highly influential doctoral programs in philosophy and the social sciences (now known as The New School for Social Research). This tradition continues into the present with a student body that is 27 percent international, which is the highest percentage of international undergraduates of any college in the United States. Also atypically, The New School grew through the acquisition of previously freestanding institutions, such as the Parsons School of Design and the Mannes College of Music, and until recently it was a distinctively decentralized institution. Beginning in the 1970s and 1980s, with the inclusion of the renamed Parsons The New School for Design and the creation of Eugene Lang College The New School for Liberal Arts, did the university have a substantial proportion of traditional-aged undergraduate students. Unlike most universities, change is a constant feature of The New School, which innovates itself with new programs, student audiences, and organizational configurations. The university also has a history of being linked to progressive movements within and outside of higher education. While this varies in form and degree across programs and divisions, many students and faculty are drawn to the institution for its perceived longstanding commitment to social justice and the public good.

The chapters in this self-study chronicle the changes and continuities at The New School over the last ten years, with particular emphasis on the last five years and expectations for the future. Among many of the changes is the formal adoption in 2013, for the first time, of a mission and vision statement for the university as a whole. The statement’s commitment to innovation and social engagement through project-based learning is a formal articulation of what most constituencies take for granted about this university’s character, although this was not always as clear to prospective students and the public as it could be. This topic, illustrative of the institution’s unique character, will be explored in greater detail in chapter 1.

SECTION I: A PROFILE OF THE NEW SCHOOL

In fall 2012, The New School had an overall student population of 10,340 students enrolled in 135 degree or diploma programs, of which just under two-thirds were undergraduates. Sixty-nine percent of students were female, and 27 percent were international. Sixteen percent of the students were members of underrepresented minorities, and 27 percent of undergraduates who entered a four-year program were Pell grant recipients. The university’s student–faculty ratio was 10:1; and, according to U.S. News and World Report, the New School had the highest percentage in the nation of classes with fewer than 20 students.

1 See our interactive timeline for a full history of The New School.
2 U.S. News and World Report generates these reports from data sourced from the Common Data Set.
In the 2011–2012 academic year, 3,064 students were awarded degrees. Students earned degrees in 92 programs or majors offered through seven academic divisions. Slightly under half of these students pursued undergraduate or graduate degrees at Parsons. Parsons’ size, scope, and connection to The New School is yet, as mentioned above, another atypical aspect of the university, as most design schools are either freestanding or a small part of a much larger institution. Parsons’ reputation is a great asset, and its presence gives the university an unusual mix of strengths from which to incubate new programs that bring design together with the social sciences and liberal and performing arts.

As will be discussed in detail in subsequent chapters, the student body is both substantially larger than it was ten years ago and differently distributed across divisions and programs. Many more students are enrolled in design disciplines, and while adult students—the university’s original base—remain a significant proportion of the undergraduate population, traditional–age undergraduates have been the source of the most growth. Among adult students, many more are degree-seekers than in the past, when the university was best known locally as a site for continuing nondegree studies.

The university’s faculty, especially the full-time faculty, has also grown with the student body. The adoption of a new faculty handbook, among other things, has been transformative for sharing both scholarly and governance processes. The university also continues to rely heavily on the contributions of its part-time faculty; in 2005, a collective bargaining agreement for a substantial number of part-time faculty was negotiated with Local 7902, Academics Come Together/ACT–UAW.

Years of rapid enrollment growth ended in 2011, which was the result of both a decision by the new leadership to put greater focus on quality and an academic market deeply diminished by the recession. Although The New School’s endowment is substantially larger today than it was ten years ago, it remains relatively small. Therefore, the operating budget is largely dependent on tuition, and so the university has reduced its expenses in a number of ways and focused new energy on recruitment and retention. At the same time, new leadership, the current economic climate, and national scrutiny of higher education have provided the opportunity and impetus for articulating academic priorities in its mission and vision statement, and for developing a roadmap for achieving these priorities through an emerging strategic plan. The new University Center, a 16-story mixed-use building that is described below, is the most visible symbol of future possibilities.

SECTION II: RECENT HISTORY

The New School’s current president is David Van Zandt, who succeeded Bob Kerrey in January 2011. President Kerrey had held that post for ten years, during which time he presided over an extraordinary number of changes at the institution. However, he also became the focal point of considerable criticism and controversy in the latter half of his presidency, including a faculty vote of no-confidence, student protests, and a sequence of short-lived provost appointments. These are all discussed in detail in the following chapter.
The most significant changes that took place during the Kerrey presidency were increases in student enrollment, the number of full-time faculty, and the university endowment; the introduction of faculty tenure to all academic divisions; and greater focus on campus facilities to improve administrative and academic functions and to provide students with additional space in the crowded Greenwich Village/Union Square neighborhood. From 2005 to 2010, degree-student enrollment increased 30 percent. In the same five-year interval, the full-time faculty grew from 253 to 415. The number of degree programs increased from 70 to 88; among new degree programs were university-wide interdisciplinary undergraduate programs in Environmental Studies, Global Studies, Urban Studies, and Urban Design. At the graduate level, Parsons added new Master’s degree programs in Interior Design, Fashion Studies, Fashion Design and Society, and Transdisciplinary Design. A new Masters in Environmental Policy and Sustainability Management was launched at The New School for Public Engagement.

During this same period of time, the university also increased its physical footprint, a significant change at an institution that had historically struggled with a lack of space for academic and cocurricular activities, which had limited the university’s potential for growth. In addition to $100 million expended on campus improvements, more than 1,600 beds were added in five residence halls. In 2008, with support from Trustee Sheila C. Johnson, four buildings occupied by Parsons were combined into the Sheila C. Johnson Design Center, complete with galleries and a student gathering space. A significant achievement of President Kerrey’s tenure was the approval by the Board of Trustees to construct a 365,000-square-foot University Center at the intersection of Fifth Avenue and 14th Street. This multiuse building is a campus anchor with new academic and study spaces, state-of-the-art classrooms, a library and cafeteria, three auditoriums, and a student residence housing more than 600 students.

In addition to growth, a key objective of Kerrey’s tenure as president was the creation of a university from the loose confederation of divisions that had characterized the formerly named New School University. In 2004, President Kerrey led the Board of Trustees to change the university’s name to The New School and to adopt the new divisional naming system to create a unified brand. Many functions that had operated at the divisional level were centralized into the departments of Finance and Business, Development and Alumni Affairs, Communications and External Affairs, and Admissions/Enrollment Management. For the first time, the administration made known which parts of the university operated with either surpluses or deficits; and meeting or exceeding ambitious enrollment growth targets determined divisional budgets.

President Kerrey’s prior career as a public figure proved to be a double-edged sword for the university. It certainly enhanced the university’s capacity to raise new resources from private donors and the federal government and to bring in high profile figures for public events. At the same time, articles about his military career and his public musings on whether to run again for office (in 2005, for mayor of New York City; in 2007, for U.S. senator from Nebraska) often attracted media attention for his public profile rather than for The New School’s academic attributes. When a number of dramatic episodes beginning in 2008 divided many constituencies, The New School became the focus of unwanted media attention that was magnified by having a famous president. Details of these incidents are provided elsewhere in this self-study.

3 Such as this NY Times article, this December 2008 article, and this April 2009 article
The dismissal of Provost Joseph Westphal in December 2008, less than six months after the dismissal of Provost Ben Lee, set off a chain of events that dragged the university into several years of internal unrest. Provost Lee had been in office only for two years, taking over from Provost Arjun Appadurai, who resigned in 2006 after serving only two and a half years.\(^4\) In the wake of Provost Westphal’s departure, President Kerrey named himself interim provost. That same December, the full-time faculty passed a near-unanimous resolution of “no-confidence” in the president and in Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer James Murtha.\(^5\) That same month, a group of disgruntled students and others from outside of The New School community occupied university facilities. Students and faculty demanded the president’s removal, stronger academic leadership, academic-based authority over resources, and shared governance. Although this occupation ended peacefully after 30 hours, a similar occupation in April 2009 was dislocated only with police intervention and more than 20 arrests.\(^6\)

These dramatic events have roots in the many changes at the university beginning in 2005. The huge growth in the student body, the fact of and the manner of the migration of tasks and roles from the divisions to the central administration, and a perceived lack of transparency led to frequent vocal expressions of frustration among students and faculty that were often accompanied by accusations of behind-closed-doors decision-making. Academic plans were proposed but never formally implemented, preventing a clear link to broader strategic planning. This contributed to the widely held perception that President Kerrey privileged administrative over academic functions and empowered Executive Vice President James Murtha over the deans and the provost. Academic budgetary authority, including approval of faculty lines and the allocation of academic space, ultimately rested with EVP Murtha.

Soon after the vote of no-confidence, the president quickly agreed to appoint a new provost, Tim Marshall, the then-dean of Parsons. Kerrey’s subsequent announcement not to seek a further term as president after 2010 paved the way for the Board of Trustees and the new president to reimagine the system of governance and to initiate a process of transition of leadership. An enhanced Provost’s Office was one major outcome in a shift toward the academic leadership having a greater voice within the university.

**SECTION III: THE NEW SCHOOL TODAY**

President Van Zandt began his tenure as president in January 2011. Working closely with Provost Marshall, he quickly moved to heal rifts between the academic and administrative sections of the university. He advanced multiple new initiatives to more fully realize the academic potential of a better-integrated institution while addressing shortcomings in the university’s financial model, which necessitated budgetary restraint.

President Van Zandt also embarked on a Service Initiative early in his term to help address ongoing issues that students and faculty had with various administrative and academic aspects of their New School experience. The number of senior-level administrators has been reduced, and

\(^4\) Dean Kenneth Prewitt of The New School for Social Research similarly resigned after about two years because of difficulties working with President Kerrey.

\(^5\) Documentation of the vote and correspondence from the faculty appears in Appendix P.I.

\(^6\) As noted in the aforementioned mentioned media coverage.
structures streamlined. Not least, the positions of executive vice president/chief operating officer and corporate secretary were eliminated, and their responsibilities were spread across other administrative departments.

A key goal of the current administration has been the creation of broader and deeper data systems to inform strategic planning. A wide range of institutionalized and iterative data collection initiatives, many centered in a revamped institutional research office (now called the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness) are underway, including a Data Warehouse and an effort to measure the cost of education by program. At the same time, after a slow start, important progress has been made in systematizing the articulation of learning outcomes and the assessment of student learning across the university. The leadership has sent an unambiguous signal supporting data-informed decision-making and institutional renewal in all key academic and administrative areas.

The president and provost, in partnership with the deans, developed the university’s first formal mission and vision statement, which was approved by the Board of Trustees in May 2013. Academic and administrative leadership have worked together in a strategic planning process in close consultation with the Board of Trustees and with a range of university constituencies. A draft of a strategic plan was presented to the university in fall 2013. A longstanding goal to expand globally has begun to be realized with the creation of a new position (vice president for distributed and global education), the relaunch of a Parsons campus in Paris, and various academic partnerships in India and China.

Debt service on the new building, in combination with two straight years of not meeting enrollment targets, has emphasized the need for cost containment in the short-run, with a rethinking of the fiscal model for the university in the long-run. This is discussed more thoroughly in chapter 2. The strategic plan focuses especially on student success, academic quality and distinctiveness, globalization, right-sizing the distribution of students across programs, the development of new programs with new streams of students, and the diversification of revenue sources. Fostering more collaboration across the divisions to create new programs and synergies is now seen as key to both realizing an academic mission focused on innovation and civic engagement and in meeting the economic challenges with new markets and existing curricula made available to students across the university.

SECTION IV: OVERVIEW OF THE SELF-STUDY

The chapters in which each of the 14 standards of excellence is addressed are identified below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards of Excellence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1 X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2 X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3 X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4 X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5 X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6 X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 1: VISION AND LEADERSHIP

INTRODUCTION

This chapter chronicles the continuity and change in the formation of a coherent academic mission and vision for the university. The New School’s initial progression from a loose confederacy of academic units to a more integrated institution began under President Kerrey and is still very much a work-in-progress. This integration enabled the first steps toward articulating a mission and vision that began in 2011, and which culminated in the May 2013 Board of Trustees’ approval of the first formally adopted university-wide mission and vision statement. The statement asserts The New School’s core principles and priorities based on curricular strengths in design and the social sciences, promotes a distinct focus on creativity and innovation, and emphasizes civic and public engagement with both a New York City focus and a global orientation. On October 13, 2013, the Board of Trustees approved The New School’s first university-wide strategic plan, which is detailed below.

The effects of the many related changes in the university’s leadership since the 2003 self-study are also detailed in this chapter. Over the past few years there has been an increased emphasis on data-based decision-making, transparency, and shared governance, as well as a stronger concern for the student experience and a culture of service. Another significant change has been the effort to engage in a planning process informed by a singular university vision.

SECTION I: UNIVERSITY MISSION AND VISION

At the last reaccreditation review, The New School scrutinized its structure, which then consisted of 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 MSCHE 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 toward the articulation of a university-wide mission and vision and the forging of institutional goals that support that mission and vision. Thus, through an active process of discussion, debate, and collaboration involving all constituencies, The New School is working to strategically shape the patterns revealed by its once disparate divisions.

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 operated for many years without a formal 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 statement was drafted. However, it

¹ Visiting Team Report (2003: 4). The MSCHE 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 MSCHE, 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. 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.
was not developed with broad input, was not formally presented to the Board of Trustees for a vote, and thus was never formally adopted, promoted, 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 The New School for Design’s (Parsons) prominence in enrollment, revenue, and academic reputation, 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 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.

When David Van Zandt became president in 2011, the Board of Trustees charged him with undertaking strategic planning to ensure that The New School’s reputation, academic quality, and financial structure would remain strong. 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. At that retreat, the Board endorsed the core elements of the vision. Subsequently, the president, along with the provost and deans, drafted a vision document to serve as the foundation for establishing academic priorities, to guide resource allocation, and to inform 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.

Throughout 2011 and 2012, the vision statement was further developed and refined with broad input. It was presented and discussed with the university community in Town Hall events hosted by the president and provost, and in various meetings with students, faculty, academic and administrative leadership, and Trustees. The president and provost shared a message inviting the community to provide feedback after posting a draft of the statement to the university’s website on November 14, 2012, and again, with revisions, on March 21, 2013. The Board adopted the final mission and vision statements on May 16, 2013.

The current mission statement reads as follows:

*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 develop both the skills a sound liberal arts education provides, and the competencies essential for success and leadership in the emerging creative economy.*

---

3 Report findings can be found in Appendix 1.I.
4 A sample of comments and resources related to the presidential search are in Appendix 1.II.
5 A survey concerning and a sample of comments on the draft vision and mission statements are in Appendix 1.III.
will also lead in generating practical and theoretical knowledge that enables people to better understand our world and improve conditions for local and global communities.

The vision highlights the distinguishing characteristics, commitments, and strengths that have emerged from the historical practices of the university’s divisions and that define The New School’s position in higher education. Creativity, innovation, and a willingness to challenge the status quo are the foundations of the creative and performing arts and design programs. These ideals are fostered in the liberal arts programs, which broaden the definition of “the arts” (beyond music and drama, to include writing, the visual arts, and dance); and in the social sciences, which emphasize critical and interdisciplinary approaches examining the relationship between the aesthetic and political dimensions of social life. Media studies and media-making are fields of study across the institution, and the emergent area of social innovation connects professionally oriented programs in international affairs, policy, and management to design and social justice concepts, struggles, and solutions.

Social engagement has been a defining characteristic of 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 The New School community in Occupy Wall Street and post-Hurricane Sandy recovery efforts, taking place even as discussions about articulating the mission and vision were ongoing, are recent examples of this principle in action. Social engagement is currently reflected in the myriad ways that students and faculty connect academic preparation with community work (both locally and globally) through internships and other forms of voluntarism. Many of the design programs also strongly emphasize community and social engagement, as do components of the performing arts programs. When the former divisions of Milano and the New School for General Studies were merged in 2009-2010, “Public Engagement” was the unifying characteristic that informed the new division’s name: The New School for Public Engagement (NSPE).

The vision statement prioritizes creativity and engagement, not just as a description of the past and present, but as differentiating strengths 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 stresses problem solving, and positions The New School to be “a university where design and social research drive approaches to studying the issues of our time.” Since the mid-2000s, the university’s academic leadership has focused on the intersection of these strengths by building new academic programs, research initiatives, and collaborative projects (see chapter 5). 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 focus on design, design thinking, and project-based learning in a university that includes a broad range of programs not conventionally associated with design—from management and public policy to creative writing to philosophy—has produced some concerns in parts of the
university community. Given that Parsons enrolls about half of the university’s students, its national and international reputation as a design school, and 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 in The New School’s vision. There have been multiple examples in recent years of the way in which curricula and projects at The New School are informed by or connected to design (and vice versa) for the mutual benefit of all students (see chapter 5).

The mission and vision statements thus articulate longstanding values and strengths as the core foci of academic innovation and investment. Yet it is true that 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.

The mission and vision statements have informed the development of a strategic plan that identifies the priority work and major goals for the university in the next five years (see chapter 6). 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 vision. A quest for broad enrollment growth is not a major driver of the plan. Rather, after years of generalized and opportunistic enrollment growth, the emphasis will be on maintaining overall enrollment and rebalancing the size and shape of programs to improve quality, leverage strengths, and elevate student outcomes as a priority; and diversify our revenue sources.

The 2013 Strategic Plan

The Board of Trustees approved a substantial draft of the strategic plan at its retreat in October 2013. The plan identifies five overarching priorities, each with its own set of goals and assessments, in support of the mission and vision statements. Following are summations of each priority. For the full text and the accompanying goals see Appendix 2.II or the strategic plan.

Student Success

This signals a focusing of academic and institutional assets on students’ learning, educational experiences, and preparation for achievement in their careers. In line with the mission and vision statement, the priority on student success emphasizes the 21st century: the hybrid cross-disciplinary nature of learning, the role of technology and collaboration in learning, and the importance of flexibility and innovation in connecting students’ education with their roles as professionals and as citizens. Improving student success requires greater emphasis on academic experiences in and out of the classroom, advising, and career placement and services.
Academic Programs and Quality

The New School will integrate and strengthen the university’s programmatic, pedagogical, and knowledge-generating offerings and capacities. The plan places priority on developing new programs, assessing the current programs on how they relate to the mission and vision statements, their economic sustainability, making student access to curricula across the university desirable and seamless, and extending opportunities for project-based learning. Improving academic quality means greater emphasis on programs and research that bring together design, liberal arts, and the social sciences, and that deploy innovative methods and experiential learning practices.

Global Education

Recognizing the importance of global knowledge and experiences for students in today’s world, The New School aims not only to attract international students, but also to access and develop The New School’s academic resources through partnerships around the world. Deepening global learning opportunities means further development of and investment in The New School’s presence in the global urban centers; increased international experiences for students to position themselves to better contribute to global well-being; and greater use of innovative, distributed learning technologies.

External Profile

The New School must actively promote the characteristics that differentiate it from its peers and ensure its identity is well known and attractive to prospective students and faculty, potential donors, employers, and the general public. Enhancing its public profile signals a greater emphasis and investment in branding and marketing that communicates the university’s unique mix of strengths, as well as its mission of innovation and public engagement. This also includes developing partnerships (such as the ones recently developed with General Assembly and Global Citizenship Year) that accentuate experiential learning for students and the institution’s broader contribution to the public good.

Infrastructure

The New School must ensure that the institution’s resources and infrastructure are organized to support its academic goals. This requires planned and sustained investments in the technological and human resources that are necessary to enhance institutional effectiveness, particularly with regard to student success.

A more complete description of the strategic plan and goals is available in the draft strategic plan and in the other chapters of the self-study, particularly chapters 2 and 6. A recurring and key challenge is to strengthen the financial model that supports the university’s academic aspirations, which is a special challenge for a tuition-dependent institution in a period of economic downturn, as evidenced by the enrollment shortfall and associated financial implications in the last two years. The strategic plan, informed by a strong university vision, will help to ensure that The New School will develop new programs and pedagogical approaches that align with its strengths and values,

6 See Appendix 5.XVII for a list of the university’s exchange and articulation agreements.
attract new student markets and strongly support their aspirations, extend its reach and elevate its profile, and create a more resilient institution.

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 toward how they have informed the current governance structures and approaches.

The two principal leadership challenges were related. Marked instability in the Provost 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 announced that he would function as interim provost, provoking anger and ultimately a vote of no-confidence by the faculty for both the president and James Murtha, the executive vice president and chief operating officer.7 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 president requested the intervention of the police. These events garnered extremely negative media coverage for the university.8

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 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 with the shifting of authority from the deans to the executive vice president. These changes, outlined in the preamble, were driven by the administration’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 (UC).

The growth imperatives especially created tensions within the institution. 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 proportion of part-time faculty (PTF) (see chapter 3). The UC also created a tension point. It was a key solution to relieving space pressures for an urban university with no formal campus, but it also created a major financial responsibility in terms of the bond issue needed to pay for much of it. Additionally, divisions were troubled by the transfer of some divisional administrative staff and authority to central offices.

---

7 A copy of the vote and related materials are in Appendix P.I.
8 Such as this NY Times article, this December 2008 article, and this April 2009 article.
This was the backdrop against which the instability in the provost’s role unfolded. A pattern evolved in which each provost would develop an academic plan and proposal for greater budgetary authority, only to no longer remain when his plan produced tension with other parts of the administration. 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 increased the role for faculty in university governance and introduced the possibility of tenure for full-time faculty across the university. As changes unfolded, the provost, deans, and some of the faculty began to call for a growth plan for enrollment and a physical plant that was rooted in academic goals and aspirations and informed by a resource allocation process that gave greater authority to the provost and deans.

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 expand participation in planning and decision making. 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.

The university bodies established to broaden communication and input related to major planning and decision making include the University Facilities Committee, the Advisory Committee on Investor Responsibility, and the Provost Office’s Faculty Affairs Committee (detailed in chapter 3). The University Facilities Committee is comprised of students, faculty, and administrators and is co-chaired by the provost and the senior vice president. The request of a group of students for a student representative on the Board of Trustees has not been presented for a formal vote to the Board, but it did establish the aforementioned 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. 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 input.

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

---

9 See chapter 3 for greater detail.
10 Documentation available in Appendix P.I.
search-related news and updates, and an opportunity to share and review comments from the community. The Board also sent an email to The New School community that outlined the search committee’s charge and membership. This membership included three faculty representatives, one student representative, 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 university culture and no-confidence vote would be addressed with prospective candidates, emphasizing “the role of openness and transparency throughout the search process.”

2011 to Present

David Van Zandt became president of The New School in January 2011. His opening message 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. In response to the difficulties and concerns that had emerged over the preceding years, the administration set about to improve transparency, administrative and governance structures, and the tone of engagement with university constituencies.

In early meetings with students, academic leadership, and senior administrators, the new president concluded that many areas in day-to-day operations were not adequately responsive to student needs, and that the culture of the university often forced students over numerous administrative hurdles. Developing a service-oriented culture and improving inefficient systems and processes became an early priority of the new president. When announcing this Service Improvement Initiative, the president 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.”

Immediately highlighted for special attention were a few key academic and administrative areas, including the organization of student financial and career services and the university’s systems for email and expense reimbursement. Attention was also paid to a longstanding complaint regarding the difficulty 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. 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; details are discussed in chapter 4. The Service Improvement Initiative continues to be a priority, with recent efforts to improve library services, eliminate most paper-based processes, and improve wireless access on campus. Service Improvement projects are identified based in part by individual feedback through online forms and surveys and through direct and informal interactions with the president in regular gatherings with small groups of students and employees.

11 A sample of comments and resources related to the presidential search are in Appendix 1.II
12 UFS Minutes, March 2, 2010. The president’s job description, which stressed collaborative working relationships, is in Appendix 1.II.
13 In addition to being an attorney and an expert in legal education, President Van Zandt also holds a PhD in Sociology.
14 See the Service Improvement Initiative message.
Since 2010, the administration has grown increasingly accessible to students and faculty, addressing community-wide concerns through discussions with students and faculty, regular meetings with the University Student Senate (USS) and University Faculty Senate (UFS), attendance at many university programs and events, and semiannual university-wide Town Halls. These Town Hall forums feature remarks from the UFS and USS co-chairs; reports by the president and provost on broader university issues, including finances; and an open Q&A segment.

In 2011, changes were made in the central administration to balance the roles and authority between senior administrative and academic leadership. The visibility and role of the Provost’s Office remained strong, with the president and provost jointly making decisions, communicating as a team, and inviting feedback from academic and administrative units into university operations.

In addition to the reorganization of the central administration, two senior leadership groups were created (Leadership Council and Strategic Group); they meet regularly to share information, advise the president and provost on key institutional issues, and collaboratively make decisions. In 2012-2013, representatives from the UFS were invited to participate in the financial discussions that occurred in Leadership Council meetings. The president also joins regular meetings that occur between the deans and directors of the academic divisions and the provost and his senior staff.

Lastly, the new leadership has engaged with constituencies in a very different tone, especially in tense situations. One clear example is the response 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. President Van Zandt stated 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 without arrests or police involvement.

SECTION III: GOVERNANCE

The Board of Trustees

The New School is governed by a Board of Trustees, which is 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

---

15 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).
16 Current and historic organizational charts can be found in Appendix 1.IV.
shared governance structure that incorporates input from students, faculty, and, where relevant, members of the local community.\(^{17}\)

The Board’s capacity to chart a course for the university’s future is exemplified by the roles the 45 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, including its size (more than 60 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 board members who have a different connection to the university.

Another major challenge was the schedule of board and committee meetings. With eleven committees (not including separate service on Boards of Governors, described below), trustees, on average, were scheduled for at least eleven meetings a year, with some trustees having to attend twenty or more meetings each year. As a result, both board and committee meeting attendance was low. Over the course of 2011–2012, a number of changes were put into motion to overcome these governance challenges, approved as revisions to the bylaws at the Board’s February 2013 meeting. These changes included a reduction in the number of annual Board of Trustee meetings from five to three and the creation of four vice chair positions for governance, finance, academic affairs, and development. The meeting number was reduced to encourage the use of conference calls or interim meetings between formal meetings to handle ad hoc discussions and to improve the rate of trustee participation at regular meetings. Additionally, in 2013, the executive committee of the Board of Trustees began meeting more frequently to address routine issues, allowing full board meetings to be used for strategic university-wide discussions.

Additional revisions included a reduction in trustee standing committees from eleven to six (Executive, Academic Affairs, Audit & Risk, Finance, Investment, and Committee on Trusteeship) and creating a few smaller project-based working groups. The reduction of the committees to these six standing committees reflects the university’s core operational functions. As such, the revised bylaws invests broad oversight authority in these standing committees to better align essential board functions to the university’s operational needs. These important structural changes improved the Board’s organizational efficiency and ensured that the standing committees continued their crucial role of analyzing and offering guidance on the university’s core operations. This includes vetting and approving decisions as mandated by the bylaws and in accordance with important policies, such as the university’s Conflicts of Interest Policy. The continuity in the Board’s key functions is reflected in the discussions and decisions examined by the Board over the last ten years with regard to appointment of senior administrative and academic staff, enrollment/budgeting, facilities, faculty appointments, and governance issues.

Similarly, the Board’s continued adherence to the Conflicts of Interest Policy is satisfied through the following measures each year. All Board members are required to complete an annual certification disclosing all known and potential conflicts of interest as defined by the policy. These

\(^{17}\) A list of the members of the Board and the Board’s bylaws can be found in Appendix 1.V.
disclosures are reviewed by the general counsel and all potential conflicts are vetted and resolved according to the process outlined in the policy. In addition to the annual certification, the university’s desire to minimize potential conflicts of interests at the Board level is carefully factored into decisions. It is apparent that if there is even an appearance of a conflict of interest, the affected trustee must recuse himself or herself from any role on the issue that gave rise to such conflict. For example, meeting minutes over the last five years, and particularly those from August 27, 2009, reflect significant discussion at the Board of Trustees level regarding potential conflict of interest issues in conjunction with the construction of the University Center facility.

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.

Senior Leadership

Prior to 2011, 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. In 2007, the provost also began to hold regular meetings with the deans. This group continues to meet bi-weekly, often joined by the president and/or one or more of the vice presidents. The senior administrative structure was significantly revamped in recent years, with some hierarchy introduced within the reporting structure.

The monthly meetings of deans and officers have been replaced by two other groupings of senior leadership. The Leadership Council comprises the president, provost, the vice presidents and chief administrators who report directly to the president, and the deans of Eugene Lang College The New School for Liberal Arts (Lang), NSPE, The New School for Social Research (NSSR), Parsons, and Mannes College The New School for Music (Mannes); this council meets bi-weekly. The larger Strategic Group comprises all vice presidents and associate vice presidents, divisional deans and directors, and the deputy provost and vice provost for academic planning and administration; this group meets monthly.

18 Minutes available upon request.
19 Organizational charts can be found in Appendix 1.IV.
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 effectiveness, and planning and administration. In recent years, the Provost’s Office has incorporated oversight in the areas of social justice, sustainability programs, and online programs.

University Faculty Senate

Historically, The New School’s loosely linked divisional structure and the small number of FTF resulted in faculty having little role in university governance. An elected UFS was not in place until 2004–2005, and it has since played a key role in the university’s development. It was periodically consulted during the development of the 2006 Full-Time Faculty Handbook (Handbook); and it played a more central role in the 2008 revisions, 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 UC in particular) and the university’s health insurance policies. As discussed previously and in chapter 3, it played a crucial role in The New School’s leadership issues between December 2008 and January 2009, and in the student occupation of April 2009. The UFS is broadly responsible for facilitating the dissemination of information to the faculty body and, when necessary, convening meetings of the faculty. The UFS has representation on most of the key standing committees at the university.

The UFS Bylaws were revised in 2012–2013 to provide a clearer articulation of its functions, membership, terms of office, the roles of the co-chairs, and grievance procedures. 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 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. Each year, senators elect members to serve on an executive board. Senate subcommittees vary, but have included finance, events, communications, and academics. Additionally, the USS provides student representatives to many university committees, including the self-study steering committee. The USS manages a substantial budget that supports student-driven initiatives.

20 The UFS bylaws are in Appendix I.VI.
21 The USS constitution is in Appendix I.VII.
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.

The New School has put significant emphasis 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 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 affairs 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 General Counsel. Thereafter, more fully developed drafts are circulated to relevant formal 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 Honesty and Integrity Policy, Sexual Assault Policy, revisions to the Guidelines for Dealing with Sexual Harassment and Discrimination, and revisions to the Handbook.

Communication of Policies

The 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 cataloged and placed on the university’s public website and on additional pages such as the Your Right to Know page and through the private portal MyNewSchool. Policies and procedures regarding student conduct are communicated in several ways: Student policies about honesty and academic integrity are described in the Student

22 All university policies are available online on the policy page.
Handbook and on the Student Rights and Responsibilities’ webpage and on the general university policy page. Each new student is issued a handbook and all students are alerted to the availability of an updated handbook each year; the handbook contains references to the Rights and Responsibilities’ webpage, where more detailed and current information is available. This webpage also promotes updates and training on numerous issues each year. Updates include:

- The Code of Conduct, updated August 2008 to clarify expectations
- The Sexual Assault Policy, adopted in 2008 and revised in 2011
- Additional policies adopted in August 2008 to support students
- Enhanced focus on plagiarism, included implementation of a university-wide policy on academic integrity, updated 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.

Academic Freedom

The New School was founded in 1919 largely because of concerns about academic freedom. As with most institutions of higher education, The New School has had a policy promoting and protecting academic freedom for decades. The university’s 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. Since the last MSCHE review, and until the student protests and occupation in 2009, there were few, if any incidents, which 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. These events led to a special committee appointed by the Board of Trustees to recommend 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. 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 in University Facilities. 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 Conflicts of Interest Policy, which requires that all decisions by members of the Board, university
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23 For reasons of sustainability, the paper handbook has been recently replaced by a PDF available for download.
24 The code of conduct is reviewed annually to assess if revisions are needed. A new version will be available in fall 2014 to reflect new Title IX regulations.
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. See chapter 4 for more information on this campaign.
26 This was the Committee to Review the Guidelines on Demonstrations in University Facilities.
managers, and faculty 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 both the General Counsel and Finance and Business Affairs. The process was further modified in fall 2011. Now Human Resources, in consultation with General Counsel, disseminates the policy and reviews the responses from designated faculty and staff. General Counsel disseminates and analyzes the annual certifications of Board members.

In addition to the Conflicts of Interest Policy, 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 Sexual and Discrimination Harassment, and the policy on Academic Honesty and Integrity. There is also a Whistleblower Policy which allows community members and members of the public to anonymously report the conduct of university officials who lack integrity.

The University’s Grievance Management System

The university’s grievance management system must show both integrity and transparency in order to be used effectively by those challenging adverse actions by the university. Each division has policies related to grade appeals and other matters related to student academic progress, whereas violations of the student Code of Conduct are managed more centrally by the Students Rights & Responsibilities Office. 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.

With regard to faculty, since 2005 the university has devoted substantial time and resources to revise and implement policies related to faculty grievance rights. Of the university’s approximately 2,053 faculty members, about 80 percent are adjuncts whose terms and conditions of employment are governed by one of two collective bargaining agreements (CBAs). The 80 or so faculty members teaching for The New School for Jazz and Contemporary Music were organized by Local 802, the Associated Musicians of Greater New York, American Federation of Musicians, AFL-CIO, in 1998; the remaining nearly 1,975 PTF are covered by the CBA with Local 7902, Academics Come Together/ACT-UAW, which went into effect in September 2005. The CBAs afford grievance rights related to every facet of an adjunct faculty member’s employment, including 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 centrally managed through Human Resources.

---

28 All university policies are available online on the policy webpage.
The grievance rights of FTF members are set forth in the 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 the non-reappointment or the denial of tenure.

**Transparency in Information and Public Representation**

The confluence of a heightened regulatory environment, pressures arising from the adverse impact of the economic downturn on enrollments levels, and advances in technology and social media have resulted in the devotion of considerable resources to promoting academic programs through a range of channels including 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.

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 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.

Annual preparation of IRS Form 990 is conducted by Finance and Business and disseminated to the Board Trustees for review and approval before being submitted to the Internal Revenue Service. The document, which discloses the university's revenues and expenses, net assets, executive compensation, and more, is also sent to anyone who requests it.

The president 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 a variety of initiatives, both structural and procedural. The Office of Institutional Research was reorganized and enhanced (as detailed in chapter 6) to meet additional data needs. In spring 2012, to more effectively and accurately communicate professional outcomes, the university instituted an annual questionnaire on postgraduation activities designed to aggregate graduating students’ plans. Lastly, the Data Warehouse Project will permit greater accuracy and transparency in institutional data with datamart access beginning in late fall 2013. These are only a few of the most recent initiatives.

**Social Justice, Diversity, and Equity**

As stated in the preamble to this self-study, the New School has maintained a reputation as a progressive institution. A number of programs have been explored over the last 30 years that support social justice and diversity for students, faculty, and staff. These recommendations and
explored initiatives have included the Diversity Initiative; the University and Diamond Scholars programs, the hiring of a vice president for Diversity and a diversity committee with representation from all sectors of the university. However, not all of these measures have been sustained through the present.

In July 2009, the Provost proposed that a working group be formed to:

Conduct an environmental scan of the programs, services and support structures at The New School that currently serve the needs of students of color (SOC) and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) students, then provide recommendations on promising co-curricular, programmatic models and structures that might be modified and strengthened to more effectively support these students at The New School.

The report, entitled Desegregating Diversity, can be found on The New School’s Social Justice website. One of the outcomes of that report was the formation of a Social Justice Committee (SJC), comprised of students, faculty, and staff, to identify areas and issues that require improvement in terms of diversity and the capacity of all constituents to be equally “at home” at The New School.

The committee has established gender-neutral bathrooms, three awards for social justice initiatives for the university community, and sponsored a number of social justice (SJ) events. Its working groups are also reviewing recruitment and retention policies; seeking funding to create a hub for SJ at the university; and mapping SJ resources to support students, faculty, or staff who encounter discrimination at the university. A critical part of the effectiveness of the committee has been a monthly meeting between the SJ co-chairs, the director of Social Justice Initiatives (SJI), the president, and the provost to develop strategies and to push forward on implementation of SJ initiatives.

The SJI office was opened in 2010. It has organized a series of campus events and campaigns; an annual student leadership retreat; and a social justice resource center with books, films, and other materials for academic and personal use. A shared university SJ calendar was established to coordinate social justice event planning and to collaboratively support SJ work across university divisions. The SJ blog was set up to share information about SJ activities on campus. In 2013, a student organizing space was confirmed in the new UC building, and a new director was hired in August 2013. One initiative achieved in an effort to build an inclusive campus culture was the adoption of the Policy for Transgender Student Identification; this policy is a part of a larger effort at the university to reflect a better understanding of gender identity.

The university’s commitment to recruiting and maintaining a diverse faculty and staff is evident in its Affirmative Action Plan,29 which examines and identifies steps to be taken to rectify underrepresentation among employees and to focus on ensuring that its hiring efforts include the broadest possible outreach to a diverse pool of qualified candidates. Since the last MSCHE 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 the largest population of international students in the country, and provides academic, administrative, and
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29 The full plan can be found in Appendix 1.VIII. The EEO policy is also listed on page 37 of the digital Institutional Policies & Procedures Manual.
social support services to ensure that these students thrive throughout their attendance, it is understood that continuing to recruit and retain 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 and reported to New York State Education Department and are published in The New School Fact Book. This is outlined more fully in chapter 4.

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.

SECTION V: RECOMMENDATIONS

- Implement an assessment process for the Board as a body and formalize the assessment of board members during their renewal process.

- Develop a process for the periodic reevaluation of the mission and vision statement and the strategic plan.
CHAPTER 2: RESOURCES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter critically examines the structures, processes, and resources that support priority setting, planning, and implementation in the service of The New School’s mission, with particular focus on financial, spatial, technological, and organizational resources. A strategic plan, the result of a two-year process, was presented in fall 2013 to the university community and reviewed by the Board of Trustees.

The New School is primarily a tuition-dependent university: tuition and fees account for 90 percent of the university’s revenue. Of particular importance are the deeply intertwined factors of planning and resource availability. Planning processes necessarily encompass the dual goals of maintaining and enhancing academic quality, while at the same time requiring constant innovation to develop programs that attract the types of students that best fit the university. This, as outlined in the strategic plan, is critical in keeping a diverse base so that fluctuations in enrollment do not dramatically impact the financial base of the university.

Dramatic enrollment growth, along with some fundraising throughout the 2000s, provided revenues sufficient to increase the hiring of full-time faculty (FTF) and to develop a new physical plant, most especially the University Center (UC). However, pressure to keep up with this growth put stress on many parts of the institution, such as the fashion programs at Parsons The New School for Design (Parsons), to maintain an aggressive growth strategy. By January 2011, it was clear to many stakeholders that programs had become too large, selectivity had compromised too many programs, and providing services to a growing and highly differentiated student body had stretched the limits of both academic and administrative staff. At the same time, operating costs continued to rise and debt service for the UC was now part of the university’s financial obligations. The enrollment downturn of 2011–2012 and 2012–2013 created budget shortfalls, which highlighted the urgency to address the university’s financial model, as well as the need to create new academic programs that would rebalance the distribution of students across the institution. This made President Van Zandt’s plan to inaugurate the university’s first strategic planning effort all the more timely and important. The strategic plan was designed to address these issues and to build upon changes in the academic and administrative structures.

SECTION I: THE NEW SCHOOL’S STRATEGIC PLAN — PROCESSES AND PRIORITIES

Evolution of Planning at The New School

Following the last decennial review, the university operated largely on an unarticulated set of goals, which defined the course of the university; there was no formal strategic planning. The most prominent of the informal plans was enrollment growth of degree students by an average of 4 percent per year between 2007 and 2017. This aggressive enrollment growth, and its accompanying revenue stream, was needed not only to fund the UC, but also to provide the
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1 A list of degree and diploma programs is in Appendix 5.1.
2 Enrollment trends from 2003 to 2012 are in Appendix 2.1.
3 The 2013 Strategic Plan is both online and in Appendix 2.2.1.
resources needed to cover the university’s cost base and for new investment and innovation. Planned increases in tuition would also provide added revenue. While tuition increases were typically at or below the national average for similar institutions, they were nonetheless problematic for The New School, which does not have a large amount of institutional financial aid to offer students.

The aggressive enrollment growth created many stresses, particularly because much of the burden for growth fell on a small number of programs, such as the well-known fashion program at Parsons, although nearly every program across the seven divisions saw a significant increase. Nevertheless, there was a positive impact on institutional renewal. Increased student housing and other services helped attract new students and created an improved sense of community. The addition of more FTF enhanced and expanded the faculty profile. Additionally, the UC, scheduled to open for classes in January 2014, should have an immense impact on the university community by providing additional space and resources as well symbolically serving the university’s mission and vision by creating a space where design and social research can happen together.

A more abstract but equally important goal was to create a better integrated university. In addition to the rebranding efforts detailed in chapter 1, academic divisions were encouraged to work more closely in order to make The New School more distinctive academically and to broaden the opportunities for enrollment growth beyond the largest programs. However, an obstacle to this goal was the divisionally located planning that centered on resource allocation based on reaching or exceeding enrollment targets. This division-centered ethos hampered the capacity to create a university-wide plan. Additionally, the lack of sustained, consistent, and strong academic leadership was a serious obstacle to progress as several academic plans were proposed but never formally implemented, preventing a clear link to broader strategic planning. In 2009, the Board of Trustees remedied this situation by committing to a stronger, better-resourced Provost’s Office, which was then given authority over the academic budget.

In January 2011, the university embarked on a two-year initiative to develop both a formal academic mission and vision statement and a strategic plan to guide The New School’s planning and resource allocation decisions going forward. One early decision was to curtail the aggressive enrollment growth path. As described later in this chapter, this decision coincided with the recession’s impact on student enrollment choices.

Creating a Planning Process

The events of 2008–2009, as discussed in other chapters, brought broader community discussion and desire for transparency regarding the university’s direction. Chapter 1 discussed how greater communication and accessibility of the university’s leadership was an important part of generating the new mission and vision statement. A similar process unfolded in terms of strategic planning in 2011–2013. Town Hall meetings and electronic communications, which each feature substantive presentations of the university’s economic and academic realities, have become regular features on campus and online. The University Facilities Committee has broadened their membership to
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4 See Appendix 2.I for enrollment trends.
5 Beginning in 2012, Town Hall meetings have been LiveStreamed with audience interaction through the LiveStreamed’s chat function and social media such as the president’s Twitter feed (@DavidVanZandt).
include more faculty, and their mandate has been broadened beyond implementation to include planning. The University Faculty Senate (UFS) and University Student Senate (USS) are now included in discussions on strategic issues.

In 2010, a Senior Budget Council (SBC), with broad administrative representation, replaced the earlier, more narrowly defined University Budget Committee. In 2011, the SBC became what is now known as the Leadership Council, and includes key administrative leadership comprising the provost, deans from the four largest divisions, and two UFS representatives. The Leadership Council’s mandate includes a variety of topics governing the university. Additionally, a second group, the Strategic Group, was created and includes all academic leadership and vice presidents. Regular meetings of these two groups have helped broaden the understanding of the financial challenges facing the institution and have enabled the deans and vice presidents to gain a clearer understanding of the operations of the academic divisions and administrative offices and move toward university-based planning.

Today there are many more cross-divisional consultative and governing bodies than had existed previously. In addition to the Leadership Council and the Strategic Group, there are regularly organized deans–provost meetings, academic associate deans meetings, and administrative associate deans meetings, all of which include members of the central administration.

Prior to having a university strategic plan, there had been various local and informal planning initiatives. The Provost’s Office proposed academic plans in 2006 under Provost Arjun Appadurai and in 2008 under Provost Benjamin Lee. The UFS also developed a white paper on strategic planning. In 2010, Provost Tim Marshall also produced an academic priorities plan. At the divisional level, Parsons has produced a number of academic strategic plans over the last eight years; Mannes College The New School for Music (Mannes) has generated a plan for a major reconceptualization and reorganization (Mannes in a New Key); Eugene Lang College The New School for Liberal Arts (Lang) is finalizing a strategic plan conducted with the support of a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation; and The New School for Social Research (NSSR) is currently undergoing a major strategic planning exercise. The New School for Public Engagement (NSPE), created by combining The New School for General Studies and the Milano School for Urban Policy and Management, underwent a year-long planning process supported by the external consultancy Downey Kates. The new strategic plan, builds on this range of planning activities conducted across various parts of the university, as well as on a series of externally conducted evaluations and reports.

From external sources, the university has sought input from consultants to gain an external perspective and strategic advice on a range of administrative, financial, technological, and academic areas. In recent years, these consultants have included Intelligent Solutions (for an information technology review), IDEO (for potential differentiators for The New School moving forward), SJR Consulting (for communications and marketing), Marts & Lundy (for development and alumni relations), and Alvarez and Marsal (for central administration and divisional overhead cost reduction).
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6 The UFS representatives are only in attendance for budget issues.
7 A list of all standing committees is in Appendix 2.III.
Use of Data and Evidence in Planning

To help develop the strategic plan and mission and vision statement, two early priorities for President Van Zandt were to expand the university’s collection, analysis, and use of data for planning purposes; and to better understand The New School’s place within the trends and landscape of higher education. Board of Trustees meetings and Town Hall meetings now regularly feature comparisons of institutional and benchmark data. There are two projects already underway to help serve this goal. The first, the Data Warehouse Project, will help standardize and systematize data collection and analysis across various university offices and functions. The project’s groundwork was laid in 2010 and now is in the first year of a three-year implementation process.

The second project, the Cost of Education Study, is an extensive effort led by the Provost’s Office to determine the full costs of the university’s wide array of academic programs. The first phase of this study was completed in fall 2011, after a two-year process that involved extensive consultation with deans, associate deans, vice presidents, and other academic and administrative staff. The result of this phase was a full cost analysis on education at The New School for fiscal years 2008–2010. As of fall 2013, the project had completed additional analyses of 2010–2011 and 2011–2012, thus creating a five-year set of analyses. Phase II of the Cost of Education Study began in fall 2013, and it includes moving the model data from a fragile Excel/Access environment to a more powerful and stable system provided by Oracle’s Hyperion Program Profitability and Cost Management module (HPCM). All past data will be moved to the HPCM and all future cost of education modeling will be done in this environment.

In addition to the two aforementioned initiatives, a number of new initiatives were needed to support and create the needed data, including the strengthening of the Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE), which now conducts or oversees all official surveys of students and faculty. With the Data Council, a committee of end users, coders, and analysts from across the university, the IRE is developing a shared data dictionary. This began as a shared living document and now is moving into the Data Cookbook (a product from iData) that, through consensus on definitions for terms and reporting elements, will create a shared language for the university around student, faculty, staff, and other institutional data. Together the Data Council, Data Warehouse Project, and strengthened IRE are moving the institution to a unified use of definitions and centralized methods of collection to increase data accuracy and usefulness in both benchmarking and planning at the university level.

The Strategic Plan

With a new mission and vision statement in place and with the many new planning and data projects in progress, the university’s leadership drafted a strategic plan to establish goals based on the mission and vision statement, to generate strategic priorities, and to identify assessment mechanisms to chart the implementation of the plan. Many of key foci in the strategic plan were drawn from the objectives and data the president and provost had presented in the previous two years of university communications and Town Halls.
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8 President Van Zandt’s original “data deck” used at early Town Halls and meetings is available upon request.
9 This is also discussed in detail in chapter 6.
A draft plan, the first university-wide strategic plan in The New School’s history, was presented to both the Leadership Council and the Strategic Group for review, and presented to the university community for input in the early weeks September 2013. A revised version of the plan was formally presented to the Board of Trustees in fall 2013 for review.\(^\text{10}\) The plan identifies five overarching priorities, as discussed in chapter 1, in support of the mission and vision statements:

- Student Success (chapter 4)
- Academic Programs and Quality (chapter 3 and chapter 5)
- Global Education (chapter 5)
- External Profile (chapters 1 and chapter 3)
- Infrastructure (this chapter)

Each priority has a set of tactics, benchmarks, and assessments, discussed in detail chapter 6, and a more comprehensive overview is available in the full document of the strategic plan. The fifth priority, infrastructure, will be addressed in the remainder of this chapter in the discussion on the financial, spatial, technological, and human resources deployed by The New School and how these resources will be prioritized and used to better achieve our mission.

**SECTION II: BUDGET DEVELOPMENT, RESOURCE ALLOCATION, AND PLANNING**

The institution is dependent on tuition and fees for approximately 80 percent of its operating costs. Including other student-related revenue (such as dormitory, dining services, and health center fees), this rises to 90 percent. For this reason, the ten-year enrollment plan developed in 2007 and the plan for building the UC were based on 4 percent annual enrollment growth from 2006–2007 through 2016–2017. While the university met or exceeded this goal for a number of years, 2011–2012 saw enrollment growth fall short of this 4 percent goal, with 2012–2013 posting an overall decline.\(^\text{11}\) As part of the strategic plan, the university will remain at its current size and develop alternative revenue streams (e.g., global hubs, online strategies, professional education, etc.) to supplement its existing resources.

The enrollment challenge has elicited two main actions. First, the university has, on a number of occasions, been forced both to cut spending and forego compensation increases for full-time faculty and nonunion staff. In 2012–2013, the university put in place strategic cost reductions that are expected to provide economies and efficiencies over the next few years. Second, the university began to emphasize investment in activities that support enrollment and academic quality and that alleviate dependence on only a few popular programs. Included in these plans are goals to tap into new markets and to offer new initiatives in global and online education. This latter goal was already a focus of The New School, and it will receive greater priority under the 2013 Strategic Plan.\(^\text{12}\)

In 2007, the University Development and Alumni Relations (UDAR) was created to concentrate fundraising efforts. This effort had support from the Board of Trustees, led by the president. Recently, the largest gifts were for the building of the UC. Currently, most gifts that the university receives are from members of the Board of Trustees or the divisional Boards of Governors.

\(^{10}\) See Appendix 2.II for a sample of comments and the strategic plan.

\(^{11}\) Enrollment trends since 2003 are in Appendix 2.I.

\(^{12}\) Chapter 5 contains details regarding changes in programmatic offerings.
Generally, the deans and faculty have led the divisional fundraising efforts. Endowments and annual gifts, grants, contracts, and other sources account for the remaining 10 percent of the university operating resources. UDAR is working to build a database of alumni in order to increase the university’s connection to them and therefore increase alumni giving. To date, most fundraising efforts have been division- or event-based. UDAR is now focusing more explicitly on giving potential regardless of divisional affiliation and on using the new mission and vision statement as a guide for mobilizing resources. In addition, a new chief development officer has been hired to continue to expand the work of the UDAR.

**Revenue in Relation to Cost and Investment**

The planned enrollment growth provided the resources needed to fund the UC and to cover structural cost increases, the costs of instruction, and related services for the additional students. Beyond these, the additional revenue was devoted to a number of initiatives. The expansion and strengthening of the Provost’s Office provided the infrastructure needed to move the university forward academically. Investment in full-time faculty included hiring additional faculty, which improved the student–faculty ratio and institutional reputation. The expansion of Tenure and Extended Employment positions across the university was a major initiative developed in conjunction with the Board. While clearly related to supporting the instruction of a greater number of students, this has also led to an evolution of academic goals. A commitment of resources inherent in the initiative included increasing base research support, internal grants competition, and infrastructure for research grant development, as well as strengthening the research profile of the university.

Since 2003, the university has shown a strong balance sheet and steady financial ratio trajectory, and has consistently received an unqualified opinion for its independent auditors. Moody’s Investor Services upgraded the university’s rating from A3 to A2 in 2006, affirmed the A2 rating in 2009, but then downgraded it to A3 in 2010 to reflect the nearly three-fold increase in debt sold to finance the UC. Standard & Poor’s assigned the university a long-term rating of A-/Stable in 2010. In November 2013, *Business Officer*, a publication of the National Association of College and University Business Officers, ranked The New School as one of the Top 10 universities in terms of net asset growth between 2000 and 2010, in a study conducted by the A. Gary Anderson Center for Economic Research.

The UC required a $301 million bond issuance, the largest in the university’s history. This bond issuance will severely limit the university’s ability to borrow money over at least the next ten years. With this in mind, planned revenue growth provided the funds to supplement the bond proceeds and gifts needed to complete construction and to cover the costs to operate the building.
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13 Details regarding gifts are aggregated into an annual report by UDAR.
14 This is detailed in chapter 3.
15 These reports can be found in Appendix 2.IV.
16 The full study is available online.
Changes in the Budget Development Process and Financial Management

In 2008, the vice president of budget and planning left the university, and that office became part of Finance and Business, bringing these two critical and closely related financial functions together. In fall 2012, the university appointed a chief operating officer to oversee these two offices. This change coincided with a call for more transparency in the budget and collaboration in the budget development process. Prior to this transition, stakeholders knew the budget process only to the extent that it impacted each stakeholder’s area of responsibility, with only the highest university leadership privy to the entire process and overall university budget. For example, deans and officers knew only what transpired within their own divisions and departments.

With the change in leadership in the budget area, the creation of the SBC and its metamorphosis into the Leadership Council, the budget process has become more transparent and collaborative, allowing for an exchange of ideas on how the process should work and how it can better integrate with and reflect the university’s current and future structure. The expanded Provost’s Office has a more significant role in the budget planning process and more flexible funding sources. The creation of the Deans’ Council and regular meetings between the deans and Provost’s Office includes an open discussion each spring semester regarding priorities for faculty hiring, in which the deans can make their case for divisional needs. The result has been a clearer sense of both academic and budget issues across the university and university-wide priorities.

The New School has extensive budget and accounting controls, policies, and procedures in place. Finance and Business has developed a standard set of management reports as part of the Budget Development and Reporting System. These reports are distributed to budget owners on a monthly basis and allow The New School to monitor budgets and to identify issues that may require corrective action.

As the process itself has become more fluid and responsive, with fewer balkanized practices, rules, and formulas, the university has recently implemented a new budget development and reporting system (BDRS) that will improve accountability and provide a means for long-range financial planning. The result is a better understanding of the budget outside of Finance and Business, open discussions around the continuing evolution of the budget process, and close collaboration between the Provost’s Office, Budget and Planning, and the university community.

SECTION III: FACILITIES AND SPACE PLANNING

The New School’s facilities have undergone a dramatic expansion and renewal over the course of the past decade. The most significant drivers of the capital commitments have been enrollment growth, enhancing and augmenting the university’s academic and student resources, centralization of administrative functions, and the construction of the new UC. In recent years the budget challenges associated with funding the operation and renovation of the university’s expensive real estate portfolio, as well as the strategic slowing of enrollment growth, has resulted in a shift in planning efforts to a multiyear strategic model that focuses on purposeful curricular adjacencies that foster interdisciplinary academic interaction. The university has embarked on a three-year

17 Organizational charts are in Appendix 1.IV.
18 Agendas are in Appendix 2.V.
initial phase of a new master plan, which includes the opening of the UC in January 2014, consolidating dormitories to be within walking distance of campus, and moving Mannes College and the Parsons fashion program to Greenwich Village, all of which will create distinctly identifiable academic hubs around various properties. This process affords the strategic goal of reducing operating costs while expanding and enhancing many academic programs. For the first time in the university’s history, all of its schools and programs will be located in the Village and arranged in an academically driven configuration.

Growth in programs, the number of enrolled students, and increased faculty and administration has expanded the university’s footprint amid expensive real estate, which has precipitated strategies for global initiatives and distance learning, alongside localized tactics for optimizing adjacencies and shared facilities. The new University Center, at 65 Fifth Avenue, has provided opportunities for faculty and student participation in the planning processes, detailed in the following section. Designed to accommodate the steady growth in the number of degree-seeking students, the 16-story UC is the largest building project The New School has ever undertaken. It will enable the university to consolidate historically dispersed communities into a centralized urban campus that better facilitates its pedagogical and institutional mission.

To illustrate this point, in 2004, The New School comprised 8,812 degree students distributed across 644,671 Net Assignable Square Feet (NASF)/1,084,357 Gross Square Feet (GSF), with 78 percent owned and 22 percent leased. In 2012–2013, there were 10,575 degree students distributed across 790,049 NASF/1,333,778 GSF, with 57 percent of the space owned and 43 percent leased. With the addition of the new University Center (365,000 GSF) and newly leased space at 6 E. 16th Street (16,700 GSF), the lease on the Williams dormitories in lower Manhattan will end (-112,203 GSF), and the owned/leased space ratio will shift to 70/30 in 2014. The centrally located University Center provided approximately 600 new dormitory beds in 2013; and will provide 58 instructional spaces, a two-story library, study spaces, and a dining hall in 2014. In 2015, with the impending sale of the midtown Schwartz Fashion Center and the Mannes building, and with other terminated leases ending, the owned/leased ratio will shift to 73/27.

Facilities in Relation to Enrollment Growth and Globalization

Over the past decade, Design and Construction and Facilities Management have addressed university enrollment growth through a series of planning and capital projects to bring about new physical space. In addition to the new UC, examples include new floors and social spaces at the List Academic Center (6 E. 16th Street); 232 W. 40th Street; 566 Seventh Avenue; the Sheila C. Johnson Design Center (2 W. 13th Street); a new Welcome Center at Fanton Hall (72 Fifth Avenue); the Stuyvesant Park Dormitory; the Student Study Center (90 Fifth Avenue); and the Student Health Center (80 Fifth Avenue). A Physical Space Inventory of the entire university campus was created in 2010–2011, and updated in 2012–2013.

---

19 All university campus planning documents are in Appendix 2.VI.
20 Ibid.
21 Details regarding the UC are in Appendix 2.VII.
22 Appendix 2.VI.
23 The inventory can be found in Appendix 2.VIII.
Enrollment growth is also being addressed through global initiatives that include Parsons Paris. In Paris, The New School entered into a lease agreement in January 2013 for a 12,400-square-foot facility to serve as the home to Parsons Paris. The facility opened for the first group of students in summer 2013. The building contains six floors that include classrooms, studios, a meeting space, a computer lab, office space, and a public meeting area/gallery. It will be capable of serving the needs of a maximum of 375 students. Planning of the new facility was led by The New School’s Facilities Department, with input from Parsons New York faculty to ensure that classroom standards of New York were met and even exceeded at Parsons Paris. Students at Parsons Paris will have access to the same digital resources as students in New York, as well as access to the libraries and cultural assets in Paris.24

In Mumbai, India, The New School has entered a relationship with a new private college: the Indian School of Design and Innovation (ISDI). ISDI is a completely independent entity, offering four-year bachelor diplomas and one-year graduate certificates. As compared with Parsons Paris, The New School’s role in ISDI is only to provide curricula and curricular oversight, quality assurance, and certificates of participation to qualified ISDI students. ISDI launched its first programs in July 2013 in a ten-story, newly constructed facility in downtown Mumbai. ISDI students do not earn a New School degree, and The New School has no direct involvement in the planning or management of the facility.

The University Center

From the early planning stages, the UC was conceived as a catalyst to promote cross-divisional and university-wide uses that reflect both pedagogical and financial planning goals. Planning of the UC began in 2006 and engaged architects, consultants, administrators, faculty, and students, resulting in new administrative processes and opportunities for curricular development and shared governance.25 Planning initiatives and reports generated during this process reflect an aspiration for the building to provide a unifying, signature identity for the university while respecting the unique histories, characteristics, and academic needs of the individual programs. Several external design consultants were retained to capture the essence of The New School’s diverse communities while accounting for the pragmatics of building in New York City. The architectural firm Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill was hired to design and program the new building, and Shepley, Bulfinch, Richardson, and Abbott, an architectural and interior design firm with a specialty in education, presented strategies for the new library.26 Parallel to these efforts, the ethnographic design firm IDEO was contracted to facilitate and incorporate feedback from students, faculty, and support staff in the planning process.27 The external reports fueled internal, peer-reviewed faculty scholarship, and faculty and student participation in site visits and field research.28

The creation of the University Facilities Committee precipitated several milestones at the university including the creation of a new capital requests process to address facility needs driven

---

25 Appendix 2.X contains documents concerning the development of the University Facilities Committee.
26 Appendix 2.XI contains all library reports documenting the evolution of the libraries from 2003 to fall 2013.
27 Appendix 2.XII contains these external facility reports.
28 See Appendix 2.XIII for the “Chainmaking” and “Chainbuilding” articles and the Lamont School reports and Sweden Little Houses Project.
by this expansion. In 2006, the UFS elected its first faculty representative for facilities planning, and in 2008 produced its Integrated Academic Policy, Space, and IT Planning Report. The report examined, from a faculty perspective, existing university infrastructure and its alignment with pedagogical missions across divisions.\textsuperscript{29} In 2009, a master planning exercise was conducted, through the University Facilities Committee, to develop the program of the new building.\textsuperscript{30} Shortly thereafter the committee approved the final design concepts and plans for the UC.

Sustainability has been central to the new building, which has a projected U.S. Green Building Council Gold LEED rating.\textsuperscript{31} The building also focuses on permitting the highest level of access to distributed learning and technology. A majority of classrooms in the UC are equipped with audio video equipment that allows lectures and demonstrations to be posted to Blackboard, Canvas, or other digital LMS assistant applications. The Distance Learning Room, a high-end “telepresence” environment fitted with a Polycom video conferencing system, includes three LCD screens, microphones, and controls for distributed/distance learning. Two of these rooms already exist on campus, as beta tests, one of which is currently being used for classes. Lecture rooms in the UC also have more limited video-conferencing capabilities. The Faculty Resource space at the UC has a conference room configured for web-based conferencing; and the remaining conference rooms are fitted with an LCD screen with laptop hook-ups.

Science Labs

In 2008, during preparations for the new UC and relocation of the Psychology Department, new laboratories were constructed on the sixth and seventh floors of 80 Fifth Avenue.\textsuperscript{32} In 2009, the fourth-floor laboratory at Lang (Room B-459) was extensively renovated to include safer ventilation, Bunsen burners, and a fume hood. In support of pedagogical development across university divisions, such as the Environmental Studies curriculum, infrastructure for six state-of-the-art science laboratories has been incorporated in the new UC. Until there is a need to expand lab-based science programs, five of these labs will be furnished as general instructional classrooms.

Performance Spaces

During the past decade, several capital projects have been completed for The New School for Drama (Drama), The New School for Jazz and Contemporary Music (Jazz), and Mannes. Projects have included a new percussion studio, practice rooms, sound booths, acoustic upgrades, enhanced amplification for piano use at Arnold Hall (55 West 13th Street); improved ventilation of the Mannes building; and planned new spring floors for Drama. In 2012, a shared digital music lab

\textsuperscript{29} In 2009, the University Facilities Committee (UFC) was created, consisting of faculty, students, and administration members. The Integrated Academic Policy, Space, and IT Planning Report presented by the UFS and documents concerning the start of the UFC are available in Appendix 2.X.

\textsuperscript{30} A 2009 analysis of social spaces across the university was performed “to investigate the effectiveness of social and collective spaces at The New School,” including short-term, mid-term, and long-term recommendations to support campuswide transformations. The report is found in Appendix 2.XII.

\textsuperscript{31} Details regarding green aspects of the UC are available in Appendix 2.VII and online. See Appendix 2.XIV for the 2008 Faculty Senate Resolution on Socially Responsible Construction Management and student ReNew School proposal presented to the UFS.

\textsuperscript{32} See Appendix 2.XV for the department specifications, construction details, and final floor plans.
was created for use by students of Lang, Jazz, Mannes, and Parsons. The new UC will include a large auditorium with expandable seating (from 610 to 812 seats) and a 60-seat Event Café for impromptu and small student performances and exhibitions.

As previously mentioned, Mannes will be moving to the main campus in Greenwich Village, joining Jazz at Arnold Hall to create a hub for performing arts in proximity to the new performance spaces in the UC. The new Mannes spaces will include a recital hall, classrooms, practice rooms, and rehearsal spaces.33

Sharing Space across Divisions and Programs

The scarcity and escalating cost of space for The New School has prompted shared resource initiatives at multiple scales. A comprehensive multiyear capital master plan outlines the realignment of many programs to improve service and foster interdisciplinary work.34 The goal is to spatially support the broader strategic objective by providing seamless access for all students to different academic resources of the institution, not bounded by division or department. With the new UC,

- Student service points will be relocated to Fifth Avenue, providing “one stop shopping” for questions related to registration, financial aid, or housing, as well as housing a Welcome Center for prospective students.
- Two axes extending from the UC will connect outlying hubs, clustering many graduate and undergraduate programs along individual axes.
- A technical resources corridor will include a “Making Center” at 25 East 13th Street, a zoning-restricted making facility (ceramic studio) at 2 West 13th Street, and digital facilities at 55 West 13th Street and 79 Fifth Avenue, as well as at the University Center.

In addition, a 2013 master plan for Parsons identifies highest and best uses of existing facilities and details a multiyear capital effort to optimize shared resources for the entirety of the Parsons population, with longer-reaching benefits to the broader The New School community.35 The report generates planning scenarios (for years 2011, 2014, and 2017) that integrate anticipated enrollment growth at Parsons and changes to its undergraduate curriculum in light of spatial and fiscal benefits and challenges presented by the new UC.

With respect to the university libraries, there will be new signature library spaces in the UC and List Center, supporting interdisciplinary engagement across divisions. The new library space has been designed to support multiple patrons with diverse reading areas (e.g., open, quiet, group, lounge) to be used by students, faculty, and staff from all divisions. Additionally, the branch delivery project will enable physical content to be promptly delivered to or returned from any library branch. The Collections budget is now distributed among disciplines and is no longer division-based. Following the reorganization of the library departments, the new university website presents the library as a point of single service for the entire university. These changes, along with greater reliance on Patron Driven Acquisition, exemplify equitable distribution of scarce resources among disciplines and according to need.

33 Appendix 2.VI.
34 Ibid.
35 Ibid.
SECTION IV: ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGY AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

The university’s Academic Technology and Information Technology function together as a single department under the chief information officer. These symbiotic offices supply and maintain the many electronic academic environments to the community at large. In 2008, a self-reflective report on Academic Technology and Information Technology (AT/IT) at The New School was produced from a faculty perspective as part of its Integrated Academic Policy, Space, and IT Planning Report. This document includes a timeline of AT/IT at the university (1980–2006), a self-assessment of the technology infrastructure at the university, its pedagogical impacts, and a set of action points.

Two large networking projects have been undertaken in response to the rapid enrollment growth. Smartphones, tablets, and ultrabooks have greatly increased the use of the wireless network over the last several years. On a daily basis, 1,400–1,700 unique wireless devices connect to the university’s network. In 2011, a significant Wide Area Network (WAN) upgrade relieved Internet-network congestion and provided space for growth in network usage. Replacement of the wireless network infrastructure has allowed for greater wireless bandwidth while creating a better-managed wireless networking environment. Having a virtualized server infrastructure has improved the time-to-implementation for these upgrades by weeks or even months, because servers no longer need to be specified, ordered, and set-up in the datacenter, but can be easily provisioned in either hours or days depending on the needs of the application.

In response to a growing need of a more flexible email provider, The New School migrated all students, faculty, and staff to Google Apps for Education between 2011 and 2012. The New School constituents formerly used Novell GroupWise, which was not popular among faculty or students. Google Apps for Education offers greatly enhanced collaborative tools (Google Docs, Google Calendar, etc.); it also offers advantages in increased email and document storage capacity. To assist in the implementation, the AT/IT offices developed an expansive calendar of digital and in-person training sessions; a dedicated website with FAQs, tutorials, and helpful information; and a precise series of communication and reminders.36

AT/IT and Distributed Education

Online learning has been a strategic imperative for the university for the last 20 years, gaining greater importance over the past decade. As early as 1985, The New School’s pioneering Media Studies program collaborated with an early provider of computer-based courses to offer a small number of online graduate courses. In 1992, the university received a grant of $300,000 from the U.S. Department of Education’s Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) to make courses available to adults “anytime, anywhere” using personal computers. By 1995, graduate students in the Media Studies program could complete a master’s degree online. Over the next several years, online classes were offered in most divisions of the university, and in fall 2012, 863 students were enrolled in online classes, for-credit and noncredit.37 The university now offers four undergraduate programs, four masters programs, and several certificate and continuing education programs that can be earned completely online.

36 In Appendix 2.XVI.
37 The New School Fact Book 2012.
To enable a robust distributed environment, the university’s online infrastructure has been built out in the recent past. The New School Distributed Education (NSDE) staff comprises a director, an associate director, and two instructional designers, and it is a unit of the Provost’s Office, apart from the larger Distributed and Global Education. NSDE provides instructional–design resources, tutorials, and technical support for faculty and students. The university also engages an outsourced 24/7 technical support vendor. Most recently the university has provided access to Lynda.com, a resource that provides 40,000+ videos and tutorials for software and professional development; it is available campuswide and on mobile devices.

The university’s online portal’s (MyNewSchool) Learning Management System (LMS) facilitates distributed education for on-campus and online classes. Through the portal, Distributed and Global Education (DGE) and AT/IT offer online assistance with instructional design, maintain tutorials, and gather important experiential data through on-line evaluations. A course site is created in the LMS for every class in the university catalog. Instructional designers on the DGE team work with faculty course developers to use the LMS (and other applications, if appropriate) to create a fully operational classroom. As problems or opportunities arise, DGE is the main support point for online faculty and students. Further, the university offers training for all online faculty. Additionally, online orientation and training sessions are held each semester for online faculty and students.

While the current online LMS—Blackboard—has been the subject of ongoing analysis by the university community, its use has grown steadily from year to year, by online courses and mixed online/onsite courses. In 2005, there were a total of 306 online-only students and 595 on-campus/online students. By 2010, there were a total of 513 online-only students and 1,528 on-campus/online students. In 2013–2014, the university will transition from Blackboard to the Canvas LMS. In fall 2013 both LMSs are available to end users as the university migrates to the new platform. As part of the decision-making process, the 1,975 faculty who taught in spring 2012 were sent an online survey about their usage of classroom presentation technology and LMS. More than 80 instructors, as well as students and staff, took part in the process that led to the selection of Canvas. Part of this process was the creation of the LMS Committee by IT and the Provost's Office to make a recommendation regarding continuing the university’s use of the Blackboard LMS or adopting another program. The committee determined that it was likely that an alternative to Blackboard would better serve the needs of the university. The review of alternatives included using test installations, talking with company representatives and other universities, performing additional research, and asking instructors to teach classes in the alternative LMS in a pilot program. The committee recommended that the university end its contract with Blackboard and adopt Canvas, which is by Instructure.

Canvas was chosen because it is more intuitive and user-friendly than Blackboard, and allows for greater use of media such as video, holding live conferences, and more. The shift from Blackboard to Canvas will enable the widespread implementation of e-Portfolios and allow for experimentation of new forms of delivery. In fall 2013, both LMSs will be available to the community, but in spring 2014, Canvas will be the sole LMS for all classes at The New School. Other technologies, such as WordPress, Ning, VoiceThread, Snagit, Twitter, Adobe Connect,

39 See Appendix 2.XVII for results of this survey.
Google Hangout, Skype, etc., will supplement the LMS in online and on-campus classes, some of which are already integrated into the Canvas interface.

SECTION V: LIBRARIES

Since 2004, multiple reports on The New School’s Libraries and Archives (TNSLA) were prepared internally and externally, examining their content and organization in light of innovations and changing demands in pedagogy, research, the library profession, and technology. The library will have a newly designed space in the UC, as well as in the List Center and Arnold Hall. These library spaces have been designed to reflect the goals of academic planning, including a focus on improved interdisciplinary collections and open reading and group study spaces, and strengthened student community; as well as an emphasis on electronic access to, rather than physical storage of, content highlighted in these reports.

Over the past several years, TNSLA have aimed to improve their services to existing divisions and programs. Vision for Renewal is the first document to come out of this process of self-examination, and was submitted to the Provost’s Office in 2011. Vision for Renewal identified five areas in which the libraries contribute to the university’s academic plan: collection, services, discovery, space, and archives. To meet the demands of these five areas, the university has placed library space and other resources as an integral part of future planning.

The collection’s development is driven by the university curricula, drawn from course syllabi and patron requests. Additionally, having a library director sit on the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) has aided TNSLA serve the needs of current and developing curricular. In order to facilitate patron request, a program for direct and immediate Patron Driven Acquisition of electronic books has been recently implemented. Now faculty, students, and staff can complete an online form requesting an item to be purchased. The Libraries evaluate all requests and acquire requested material in priority order.

Services, both virtual and on-site, are offered to all divisions by a staff of eight librarians who offer instruction to users one-on-one, via library-sponsored workshops, and through classroom integration. In addition to providing access to print and electronic course materials, the Reserves Department also creates electronic scans when possible and obtains copyright clearance for all materials on reserve. In 2012, an Archives and Special Collections department was established within the university’s Libraries and Archives, with the aim of consolidating various collections of archival materials at The New School.

The libraries have made remote access to content a priority collection development and customer service strategy. Over the past five years, The New School’s investment in electronic resources has

---

40 Appendix 2.XI contains all library reports.
41 Ibid.
42 At the hub is the Kellen Design Archives at Parsons, which is a part of the library system and which has a fully discoverable collection of archived material on the history of Parsons. For the past three years, the director and staff of the Kellen Design Archives has digitized materials from the collection for open online accessibility to the public, and for incorporation into graduate and undergraduate curricula and syllabi across The New School divisions. Consequently, the purview of the Kellen Design Archives staff has expanded to include archival materials from across the university.
significantly increased to allow the library to acquire quality content that directly supports the academic programs taught at The New School. Investment in electronic resources, including e-books, has increased, making more content accessible to remote users. Digital resources have expanded so that the collection is now more than 70 percent electronic (the journal collection is 98 percent digital), and accessible to both on-campus and distance learners. The e-reserves department at the libraries acquires copyright permissions for online classroom use and digitizes static copies of materials for online classes. The librarians use technology (LibGuides, LibAnswers, Screencasts) to provide services to distance learners.

Increased virtual services are offered through online research guides and an “Ask Us” service. To increase access to e-books, Patron Driven Acquisitions are now offered, leading to an additional 60,000 (and growing) e-book titles that are available to search and download. In 2008, TNSLA began digitizing The New School’s archival collections, providing access to The New School students and researchers around the world. Additionally, the Libraries and Archives staff is working with developers on a digital asset management system that will experiment with new modes of presentation.

Interinstitutional Arrangements for Resource Access and Sharing

The New School’s community belongs to a large consortium of libraries and resources in the region. Historically, NYU’s Bobst Library has been the primary library resource for The New School, both in terms of print collection and space. This dependence on other institutions limits The New School’s capacity to serve its students; in particular, the consortium agreement is no longer adequate to meet increasing patrons’ demands for remote access to electronic content and improved facilities.

In part, this inadequacy has driven the digitizing of The New School’s journal collections. Likewise, until recently, the shared discovery tool (Bobcat) had been exclusively maintained and supported by NYU. As discovery of electronic content becomes more complex, The New School staff is increasing its participation in developing Bobcat to better respond to its own constituent needs. The staff has partnered with NYU staff in the development of next-generation discovery tools (i.e., an enhanced, integrated catalog) to further enhance each individual university’s collections and the benefits of the consortium agreement. The library staff continually works with NYU to improve their shared catalog, which incorporates discovery and access of electronic resources, in addition to physical holdings. A new contract with NYU has been negotiated to increase access to electronic content at a much lower cost. Additionally, The New School’s participation in the Metropolitan Library Council and other library consortia has produced discounted electronic resources.43

Changes to Library Resources

From a budgetary standpoint, TNSLA is moving from an ownership model to a leasing model. Subscription costs regularly outstrip budgets, requiring new strategies. This is an ongoing conversation. Organizationally, the Libraries and Archives shifted from a branch-based structure

43 The consortium contract is available upon request.
to a centralized model based on common functions, which more efficiently uses a small staff. These functions are: Patron Services, Reference and Instruction, Digital Library and Technical Services, and Archives and Special Collections. Whereas the previous structure had a distinct manager at each branch/location, the centralized model moves the directors to functional areas. Library services are adapting to new technologies, such as instant virtual reference and self-checkout, which were each launched in 2012. Discovery tools and catalogs require more customization and development to meet student and faculty needs.

SECTION VI: ADMINISTRATION

Profile of the Administrative Staff

The university currently employs 1,325 full-time administrative staff and 66 part-time staff. The roles and functions of the key individuals (and when appropriate, the administrative units that they inhabit) are identified in organizational charts and are discussed below. While administrative staff numbers have increased over time, especially in response to the growth of student enrollments, full-time faculty hiring has been the larger priority. For example, between 2007 and 2010, total staff increased by about 7.5 percent while total FTF increased by approximately 25 percent.

As mentioned previously, many administrative functions and positions were transferred in the mid-2000s from the divisions to the central administrative office. The most significant of these reorganizations are detailed in the following section. Communications and external affairs, development and alumni relations, and admissions reporting shifted from the deans to the vice presidents, albeit sometimes with a dotted line report back to the appropriate division. In theory, the benefits of centralization were clear; it would be easier to avoid duplication, develop and implement university-wide policies and priorities, offer consistent service to students and faculty, and facilitate collaboration. In practice, centralization became part of the growing antagonism between the divisions and the central administration, and more generally between academic structures and administrative offices.

Currently, there is strong recognition that central administrative capacity, in coordination and communication with locally based colleagues, is critical for efficient human resource allocation in a tight economic climate, especially for the planning and the implementation of the 2013 strategic plan. Administrators and academics now regularly collaborate as part of joint management bodies and committees. Additionally, the relatively recent move in oversight of the academic budget to the Provost’s Office, and the increased staff to manage it, has deepened working relationships between the central office and divisional deans’ offices.

In addition to the physical and organizational efforts to improve service by centralizing key services, the coordination between central and local service providers has been one facet of the President’s Service Improvement Initiative. This initiative has been a key administrative change since 2011. This initiative is designed to monitor the customer service experience and to determine

44 See Appendix L.IV for organizational charts.
45 As evidence of the qualifications and suitability of key office holders, CVs and functional job descriptions are available upon request.
areas for improvement. To bring into focus the commitment to refine and improve service, the university also launched a feedback website to collect “kudos,” “challenges,” and “suggestions”; the website is administered by the President’s Office.

To improve academic and administrative communication, the university has reorganized the reporting structure of the university’s central administration. The position of executive vice president (EVP) and the office of the Secretary of the Corporation have been eliminated.

Some of the officers and functions previously reporting to the EVP now report as follows:

- The Senior Vice President for Human Resources and the Chief Information Officer report to the Chief Operating Officer.
- The Vice President for Design and Construction and all of Facilities and Security report to the Chief Legal Officer, and Secretary of the Corporation. This position took on many of the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Corporation when the office was dissolved. The position remains, while the remainder of office has been redistributed.

The following positions report directly to the President:

- Provost
- Chief Legal Officer, and Secretary of the Corporation
- Chief Operating Officer
- Senior Vice President for Enrollment and Career Services
- Senior Vice President for Student Services
- Chief Development Officer
- Chief Marketing Officer

Leadership Skills

Within the past five years, job descriptions for several vice president positions and deans have included the following desired or required qualifications

- Leadership and management skills
- Communication skills
- Collaborative interpersonal skills
- Sophisticated understanding of high-level management issues related to operating a university
- An understanding of the higher education marketplace
- Proven experience in disciplines related to their position at The New School
- Advanced academic training

Restructuring of Admissions and Recruitment

Given the importance of meeting enrollment targets under what had been an ambitious growth plan, admissions and recruitment have received considerable attention. In 2005, all admissions and recruitment efforts were centralized and an Assistant Vice President of Admissions position was created. The assistant vice president of University Admission, Student Financial Services, and Registrar’s Office was therefore consolidated under the senior vice president for Student Services.
In 2007, the university appointed a vice president for Enrollment Management under which all admissions and recruitment functions reported. All student service functions remained under the senior vice president for Student Services. Since this restructuring:

- All admissions coding and processing have been standardized.
- Online applications have been implemented.
- Standardized test scores reported to The New School are now received electronically and uploaded into the Student Information System.
- The production of standardized university-wide admissions reporting has been established.
- An admission prospect management system has been implemented.
- Student profile reports have been standardized.
- The Welcome Center was created in 2007 to develop a campus tour program.
- The Student Contact Center was implemented in fall 2011 to handle all incoming phone calls for the Enrollment Management offices, including Registrar, Student Accounts, Financial Aid, and Admissions, with the goal of improving customer service to prospective and current students.

SECTION VII: RECOMMENDATIONS

- Create an iterative annual budget process that coordinates planning and resource allocation to increase efficiencies and reinforce university-wide initiatives, goals, and the strategic plan. Additionally, create a related process to address additional funding throughout the year.

- Divisions and administrative units reevaluate and reconcile their strategic planning efforts with the newly adopted university strategic plan.
CHAPTER 3: FACULTY

INTRODUCTION

The New School faculty is at the center of the university’s academic achievements and critical to fulfilling the goals of its newly adopted strategic plan, particularly with regard to student and academic success. Many of the developments that have occurred in the years since the last self-study, with respect to the size and composition of the faculty, as well as the conditions under which they work, are expected to substantially increase their success and effectiveness. Four interconnected developments have been particularly transformative

1. An increase in the uniformity of terms and conditions of faculty employment across academic divisions as seen, for instance, in the development of university-wide full-time faculty (FTF)
2. An expansion of job security with the extension of long-term employment contracts (tenure and extended employment, which are defined below) to FTF members throughout the university, and the adoption of collective bargaining agreements for all part-time faculty (PTF)
3. A significant centralization of faculty affairs and faculty services, ranging from establishing faculty search procedures to allocating teaching assistance and research support, and
4. The empowerment of the faculty, partly through the University Faculty Senate (UFS) (established in 2004–2005) and, more generally, as a result of the growing commitment to “shared faculty governance” at all levels, with new value placed on meaningful faculty participation in decisions concerning the academic life of the university

This chapter describes and evaluates the changing role of the faculty in The New School’s “academic, professional, research, and service programs,” with a focus on the impact of these transformative developments. The chapter is composed of ten sections, starting with a brief overview of the composition of the faculty across the university. The following sections describe and critically examine the following faculty-relevant issues: categories and conditions of employment; recruitment and hiring processes; evaluation procedures; faculty governance and its evolution; teaching and curricular oversight; service; research, scholarship, and creative practices; and the results from a recent university-wide survey of FTF. The last section of the chapter outlines several recommendations for future improvement.

SECTION I: FACULTY COMPOSITION

Between 2003 and 2012, The New School dramatically increased its number of FTF, while PTF remained a major contributor to the educational activities of the university. The increase in FTF

1 Parts of this chapter draw on survey results of FTF through the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey. The survey was first administered in fall 2012, and will be administered every three years henceforth. COACHE is completely confidential and has been handled by the Harvard Graduate School of Education since 2003. It entails completing a 25-minute web-based survey from a unique URL that is emailed to each FTF member. This survey is designed to determine each FTF member’s current job satisfaction and to compare it with peer institutions through an independent, research-driven, comparative study. Data from this survey is used throughout this chapter as a means of documenting and contrasting the attitudes and perceptions of different faculty constituencies with respect to the mission, policies, and goals of the university.
has permitted a more appropriate distribution of FTF and PTF across the university, which is reflective of the needs of each program. For many programs, PTF often provide students with crucial links to the professional world and to communities of top-notch designers, performers, and practitioners.

The number of FTF members at The New School has risen significantly since the last MSCHE self-study, as has the ratio of FTF to PTF. In fall 2012, the university employed 421 FTF, which is a 165 percent increase from fall 2003, when only 159 FTF worked at The New School. For the same period, the number of PTF members rose only slightly, from 1,605 in 2003 to 1,632 in 2012 (after peaking at 1,802 in fall 2006). The percentage of faculty at the university classified as full-time rose from 9 percent in 2003 to 21 percent in 2012, thus becoming a far more prominent presence in many of the university’s programs and systems of governance. However, as discussed below, part-time faculty members will continue to play a significant role at the university.

Full-time faculty positions have increased differentially across the university, with the largest number added to the divisions that serve the most undergraduates, which are Parsons, Eugene Lang College The New School for Liberal Arts (Lang), and The New School for Public Engagement (NSPE). Parsons, the largest division, had the greatest FTF increase, with 158 FTF employed in 2012. This is an increase of 66 FTF (58 percent) since 2006. This growth reflects The New School’s goals of strengthening the scholarly profile of Parsons, growing its graduate programs, and enhancing its engagement with programs throughout the university. However, Parsons’ enrollments grew so dramatically that its overall full-time equivalent (FTE) student-to-FTE faculty ratio rose from 8:1 in fall 2006 to 10:1 in fall 2012. Meanwhile at Lang, the student-to-faculty ratio decreased from 17:1 to 15:1, and its increase of 65 FTF represents a 47 percent increase of FTF. This has enhanced Lang’s mission of hosting small, seminar-style learning.

Diversity of faculty by gender, race, and ethnicity has remained largely unchanged in recent years. However, according to a 2010 Diversity Benchmark Study, The New School faculty is more diverse than the majority of its peer schools as measured by percentages of faculty of color and international faculty. The share of female faculty has been steady at just below 50 percent of both FTF and PTF. In terms of race and ethnicity, in its reporting, the university distinguishes between U.S. citizens and international faculty, with international faculty not included in calculations of race and ethnicity. The New School has a relatively high percentage of international FTF, at 9.7 percent in 2012, which has not significantly changed since 2006. In 2012, minority U.S. instructors comprised 16.2 percent of all FTF, which is a decline from 20.9 percent in 2006 (although the absolute number increased from 60 to 70). The percentage of minority PTF rose from 14.2 percent in 2006 to 16.3 percent in 2012.

---

2 Ratios are based on the headcount of all PTF and FTF members.
3 To review comparisons of FTF:student FTE (full-time equivalent) and PTF:student FTE in 2003 and 2012 for the university and by division, see Appendix 3.1.
4 This is based on federal reporting requirements.
SECTION II: CATEGORIES AND CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT

Prior to fall 2007, tenure and tenure-track appointments were available only at The New School for Social Research (NSSR). As part of the wide-ranging changes formalized in the Full-Time Faculty Handbook (Handbook) in 2006 (and subsequently updated in 2010 and 2013), Tenure-Track/Tenure and Extended Employment appointments were introduced as two Principal Faculty categories available throughout the university. With a subsequent revision to the Handbook in 2010, employment categories for faculty on a variety of term contracts were regularized and the employment category of Renewable Term Appointment was added as a Principal Faculty category. Faculty ranks (instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor) were also introduced where they had not previously existed at the university, for all Principal Faculty. Rank is not tied to employment category. Together, Principal Faculty are “responsible for planning and managing the curriculum, the supervision of junior and part-time colleagues, and maintaining academic quality.”

The Handbook sets out different expectations for each Principal Faculty category:

- **Renewable Term Appointment (RTA; fall 2012 headcount was 201):** RTA contracts are generally made for periods of three to five years. They “carry no presumption of continuing employment beyond the specified contract period,” but may be renewed indefinitely subject to “institutional need” and “meeting expectations for performance.”

- **Extended Employment/EE-Track** (EE; fall 2012 headcount was 42): EE Track carries a “presumption of continuous employment, subject to a triggered and post-promotion performance review” and “to demonstrable institutional need.”

- **Tenure or Tenure-Track (TT; fall 2012 headcount was 187: 111 Tenure, 76 TT):** Tenure represents the “ultimate long-term commitment on the part of the university to an individual faculty member.”

In addition to Principal Faculty, four other FTF categories are currently in use: Visiting Faculty; Fixed-Term Faculty; Post-Doctoral Fellows; and Research Fellows. Both FTF and PTF appointments, evaluations, and promotion opportunities are now governed by clear guidelines articulated in the 2013 Handbook and in the two Collective Bargaining Agreements for PTF.

The Full-Time Faculty Handbook

The New School’s history of divisional decentralization is reflected in the terms and conditions of full-time faculty employment. Key conditions, such as faculty categories, appointment types and ranks, review and promotion procedures, workload expectations, research support, and leave policy (paid and unpaid) were quite different depending on which division, or even (in some cases) which program or school within a division a faculty member joined. At the time of the 2003 MSCHE review, only NSSR and Milano (now part of NSPE) had produced faculty handbooks that

---

6 See Handbook (2013: 5), also available in Appendix 3.II.
7 Full definitions are in the Handbook; for all FTF broken down by appointment category: rank: review status, see Appendix 3.III.
8 Note that EE-Track is now a closed category; only FTF who were in place in 2006, when the new university-wide categories were introduced, were eligible to elect this track. Only select RTA faculty can now obtain this track, but it is not a separate track, per se.
outlined the conditions and terms of employment for FTF, including faculty rights and responsibilities.

The Provost’s Office began developing the Handbook in 2004, and it disseminated the first draft for comment in September 2006. Produced with significant input from external consultants, divisional deans, and the newly formed University Faculty Senate (UFS), this document was a major attempt to establish consistent full-time employment policies and to make them available in a single handbook.9

Beyond the regularization of faculty categories and the introduction of tenure, a significant feature of the 2006 Handbook was that it institutionalized shared faculty governance. One key dimension of this role for the faculty is in the regular revision of the Handbook itself. While it was expected from the inception that it would require regular updating, its implementation revealed inconsistencies, oversights, and ambiguities that needed to be addressed. Soon after its adoption, the co-chairs of the UFS’ Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) worked closely with the Provost’s Office on a range of unresolved issues, including the definition of Extended Employment, clarification of the nature of term appointments and of track choice, the nature of post-EE Track reviews, the need for greater support for faculty professional development, and equity in workload. This dialogue led to a fall 2008 memo to the Board of Trustees that proposed changes to the Handbook.10

In 2010, a modestly revised Handbook was produced. In fall 2011, the provost created the provost office’s Faculty Affairs Committee (pFAC), which was chaired by the deputy provost, to address the most challenging and contentious issues surrounding the faculty policy development process. This committee used a process that allowed for the provision of input and the vetting of decisions by significant constituencies at multiple points in the development of a policy. The pFAC was charged with generating a Green Paper, or a discussion document, that laid out the issues regarding a chosen topic or concern and to present “models, options, and pros and cons of various approaches.”11 The Green Paper was reviewed by the provost and then circulated for comments. “Feedback was channeled through the relevant divisional committees as designated by the deans and the Faculty Affairs subcommittee of the Faculty Senate.”12 The pFAC then produced a White Paper, which presented “a more formal argument and proposal.” The White Paper was then forwarded to the provost, the Faculty Senate, and the Deans Council for comments. After any issues were resolved, the policy went through the standard approval process at the university and was ratified by the Board of Trustees. Two key issues recently addressed used this new process—with significant results—and which appeared in the 2013 version of the Handbook: divisional supplements (which outline the principles of and template for a divisional handbook charter) and the Policy and Practices for Faculty Promotion in Rank. Future White Papers will focus on academic leave and faculty workload policies.

9 Provost Benjamin Lee’s memo, “Full-time Faculty, Faculty Senate, Deans, and Officers,” S.26.2006.
11 Provost’s Office’s memo, “Faculty Policy Development Process Academic Year 2011–12.”
12 Ibid.
Part-Time Faculty

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) that began covering most part-time faculty on September 1, 2005 (discussed below) established uniform statuses for members of Local 7902, Academics Come Together/ACT–UAW. PTF at The New School for Jazz and Contemporary Music (Jazz) not covered under the CBA negotiated with Local 7902 are under an earlier CBA signed in 1998 with Local 802, the Associated Musicians of Greater New York, American Federation of Musicians, AFL-CIO. This earlier contract was arranged because the PTF in Jazz are working musicians and, for most part, Local 802 is the union that represents them in recording studios, clubs, and theaters. The contract is, in many ways, similar to the one with Local 7902 in that it provides Jazz faculty with job security (based on seniority) within the division, benefits (such as health insurance coverage, either through the university or a plan sponsored by Local 802), and retirement plan coverage.13

As detailed in the university’s 2008 Periodic Review Report, the initial contract with the ACT–UAW was bargained for approximately 18 months during Calendar Years 2004 and 2005. It became effective on September 1, 2005, and extended through August 2009. The contract established a new uniform framework for appointing, evaluating, supervising, providing benefits to, and paying part-time faculty at every division except Jazz, supplanting a web of “local” policies and procedures that varied significantly by division and program. The contract increased job security by establishing “base loads” (a set number of hours that the university was required to assign to senior PTF who had taught for at least ten semesters); required the university to assign teaching to those faculty members based on their seniority and qualifications; and established economic remedies for senior faculty if they were assigned fewer courses than their base loads. It also guaranteed cancellation fees for postprobationary PTF; provided across-the-board salary increases each year, starting in 2005–2006; established minimum hourly rates for teaching and other “extra duties” (e.g., advising or tutoring); and awarded longevity pay supplements.14 PTF members who were assigned additional duties received various rates depending on the kind of work assigned, and were paid at different rates as defined in the governing CBA. How and when part-time faculty members were assigned to committee work varied from division to division.

The second agreement between the university and the ACT–UAW, which extends from September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2014, renewed the key terms of the initial contract with some modifications. Important changes include the clarification of the role of the Labor Management Committee, which is a venue where union representatives and university administrators meet to discuss key issues. The new contract specifies that PTF can raise concerns regarding plans for new and existing facilities with the Labor Management Committee, charges the committee with addressing the appropriate inclusion and participation of PTF on curriculum committees, requires the provost to meet with the committee each semester for a dialogue on the subject, and specifies that the committee will review and approve methods of evaluating teaching.15

13 The CBAs can be found in Appendix 3.IV.
14 Parsons’ practice of offering paid leaves to part-time faculty was extended to senior faculty with grandparented or multiyear status.
15 Other alterations include introducing an explicit “look-around” process to find replacement courses for faculty whose base loads have not been met, expanding opportunities for paid and unpaid leave, and modifying health and dental benefits. Additionally, recognizing the union’s role as representative for hundreds of PTF, the university provides the union with an office on campus where its representatives can meet privately with faculty.
Under the ACT–UAW contract, PTF are categorized into five classifications, depending on how many semesters they have taught at the university. From least to most senior, these categories are probationary, postprobationary, annual, grandparented, and multiyear (the latter includes a peer review process). Signaling the stability and commitment of these instructors, the majority of PTF are postprobationary or more senior, meaning that they have taught at The New School for five or more semesters. In 2012–2013, only 975 of 2,394 PTF (40.7 percent) were probationary. Academic titles for PTF (e.g., part-time lecturer, part-time assistant teaching professor) are tied to category status.17

SECTION III: FACULTY HIRING AND RECRUITMENT

The New School recruits FTF members from around the nation and the world, and hires PTF members who provide vital links to thriving professional, artistic, and academic communities in and around the New York City region. Recruitment and hiring practices for both faculty groups have undergone extensive review and reform in the past decade, with both processes becoming increasingly transparent and standardized.

Prior to 2005, decisions concerning the number and location of new FTF lines were reached through bilateral negotiations between individual deans (representing divisions) and the provost and executive vice president (representing the university), and searches were managed almost entirely at the divisional level. A more centralized system began to emerge between 2004 and 2006, and was formalized in 2008, when the university’s first Deans’ Council convened. Under the current system, all proposals for new faculty lines are brought before the Deans’ Council for discussion and, to the extent possible, consensus among the deans and provost. Factors considered include budgetary conditions, projected enrollments, and plans for new or substantially altered academic programs. Whenever possible, the university has sought to craft faculty lines that add value to multiple programs within or across divisions.

To ensure that all searches are conducted in a uniform and equitable manner, the Provost’s Office has produced a packet titled “FTF Search and Hiring Guidelines” for distribution to the chairs and members of search committees, as well as to deans and other relevant parties. The current guidelines (which were last revised in September 2013) include step-by-step instructions on the search and hiring processes, from requesting a search, to making an offer, to drafting an appointment letter. Search committee responsibilities are clearly articulated and stress the importance of attracting and considering a diverse pool of applicants. Search committee chairs are required to include “information regarding the ethnic, racial, and gender make-up of the initial applicant pool, the semi-finalist pool and the final pool” in final reports submitted to the appropriate dean, and must include a paragraph describing their efforts to increase diversity.18

Searches have generally attracted large and highly qualified applicant pools, which has led to well-matched hires across the university and employment categories. For several years in the late-2000s, the university hired approximately 30 new FTF per year. The pace of faculty hiring slowed in 2012, largely due to financial constraints produced by the university’s failure to reach

---

16 See Article XIII of the union contract.
17 A table of the quantity of PTF faculty since 2006 and a table of 2013 PTF categories can be found in Appendix 3.V.
18 This packet can be found in Appendix 3.VI.
enrollment targets. In 2011–2012 (for anticipated hires in 2012–2013), the university initially approved 25 searches but cancelled 18 of them due to the revenue shortfall. In 2012–2013, 21 searches were approved for new and replacement faculty lines, suggesting a return to a moderate and sustainable rate of hiring.

Interviews conducted with representatives of the deans’ offices and the Provost’s Office in December 2012 and January 2013 described an ongoing process of institutional learning about the components of a successful search. Responses suggested satisfaction with search outcomes, attributing success to factors that include the strong reputation of The New School and its component divisions, the university’s location in New York City, and that many of its searches were conducted in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis when other universities nationwide were cutting back on hiring. Moreover, the introduction of tenure and extended employment opportunities throughout the university are thought to have attracted high-caliber applicants who might not have otherwise considered The New School.19

One important issue that the university wrestles with is that, because its funding is largely enrollment-driven, academic year budgets are finalized comparatively late and searches approved even later. In the past, the university did not begin the hiring planning process until the summer, which meant that in some fields, recruiting conferences had already been completed and offers were made before its search process had even begun. The schedule has now been moved up so that discussions about possible searches begin within the Deans’ Council meetings in mid-spring. However, the uncertainty of enrollments, and thus budgets, limits the capacity to commit to hiring in advance, and so searches are often still approved later than at other institutions.

Once full-time faculty are hired, the university turns to an “on-boarding” process. The goal is to facilitate the integration of new faculty members into the university community. Initiated at the university level when substantial new hiring began in 2007, the process has since been revamped, with the Provost’s Office coordinating between relevant academic divisions, human resources, and other administrative offices. The new welcoming process is reviewed and revised every year based on feedback from the divisions and the emerging needs of the new faculty.20

Before a PTF hiring process is started, chairs and directors are required to conduct a “look-around” to see whether qualified existing PTF within the university with whom there is a base-load obligation can teach the available courses. If there is no currently employed, qualified PTF whose load is unmet, the chairs and directors may seek candidates from outside the university. They most often seek candidates via informal networks and colleagues at other universities. In addition, the university maintains a pool of applicants; it has a posting for part-time faculty open at all times, so that potentially interested instructors may submit their CVs. Program and department chairs and directors are encouraged to review that pool of available instructors when they seek to hire new PTF instructors.

19 The university does not record why offers are declined, but interviewed representatives from the different deans’ offices generally believed that candidates declined due to disappointment with compensation, which was understood to include salary but not university housing; hiring offers not forthcoming for spouses or partners; or inadequate research resources, particularly in certain hard and social sciences.

20 Previous agendas and the current “survival guide” for this activity are available in Appendix 3.VII. Examples of the physical materials received during this event are available upon request.
SECTION IV: FACULTY EVALUATIONS, REAPPOINTMENTS, AND PROMOTIONS

Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty: Evaluations

The centralization and standardization of policies governing FTF annual evaluations, and reviews for reappointment and promotion, has led to a significant increase in uniformity across divisions and programs. However, there is evidence that there is still much work to be done in enhancing and nurturing a university-wide faculty culture that better reflects this changing reality. For example, responses from the COACHE survey indicate that faculty are dissatisfied with tenure policies. However, as explained below, this is in stark contrast with the high success level faculty experienced in the reappointment and promotion process, which is 90.3 percent for terminal reviews, and 91.3 percent when reappointment reviews are included. In contrast to the variability (albeit now decreasing variability) that has characterized past FTF evaluations and reviews, PTF evaluations and reviews follow the guidelines of PTF contracts and thus, by definition, have a mandated uniformity and consistency.

Full-Time Faculty: Reappointments and Promotion Reviews

The New School divisions now all follow a single procedural timeline for reappointment and promotion reviews. The timeline, which is posted on the Provost’s Office’s website, covers approximately 17 months, which is from February 1 of the year preceding the review (when the Provost’s Office notifies the deans and faculty of upcoming reviews) to June 30 of the review year (when the Provost’s Office notifies the deans and faculty of decisions taken by the Board of Trustees). A dossier compiled by the faculty member is the central instrument for all FTF reappointments and promotion reviews, and depending on the review type and division, specific or additional items might be added to the dossier by a dean’s office for consideration by the divisional review committee.

Prior to 2007, the only faculty eligible for tenure review were members of NSSR departments. Faculty at Milano (now part of NSPE) were eligible for a tenure-like status called Extended Employment. With the adoption of the Handbook in 2006, tenure and a version of Extended Employment (the latter differed from what existed at Milano) became possible for a large number of faculty who were on term appointments. Most term faculty were given a choice of either retaining their status under term contracts or applying to be reviewed for the newly available statuses (tenure or EE). Counseling on the options was provided by the relevant dean’s office and the Provost’s Office, although many faculty reported that counseling availability was uneven or that information from different sources was inconsistent, resulting in additional stress for faculty undergoing reviews, as well as for those serving as reviewers.

---

21 A full analysis of COACHE responses can be found in Appendix 3.VIII.
22 Website instructions and the template for a positive review letter are in Appendix 3.IX.
23 EE at Milano prior to 2006 was a status akin to tenure for faculty whose work was typically in fields taught at Milano (primarily public and urban policy, organizational development, nonprofit management). Once tenure became available university-wide, Milano faculty with Milano EE could choose to stand for tenure with up-or-out tenure reviews or retain Milano EE. With the exception of one faculty member, all Milano faculty with Milano EE elected to stand for tenure.
In 2010, a new employment category for term faculty was formally adopted by the Board of Trustees in the context of the approval of the revised 2010 Handbook. The category of Renewable Term Appointment (RTA) is an employment category in which a faculty member is eligible for renewal based on both effective performance and institutional need (which is based on job descriptions). Appointment/reappointment lengths can range from two to seven years. Additionally in 2010, the university introduced a standard process for reviewing RTA faculty who were up for reappointment.

Between 2007 and 2012, 85 tenure reviews were conducted. Of those, 14 were faculty at NSSR. Seventy-one tenure reviews were conducted of faculty members at other The New School divisions where tenure was newly available. Review committees at the levels of programs, divisions, and university were assembled to support this process, and external reviewers were relied on in the early years for faculty undergoing tenure reviews in programs and divisions that lacked tenured faculty. The first cohorts of faculty reviewed for tenure and EE were generally those who had been hired prior to 2006. Some of these faculty members had come to the university from tenured appointments elsewhere, and were mid-career or senior scholars at the time of their tenure or EE reviews at The New School.

While the first year of reviews under the 2010 Handbook were necessarily managed through an ad hoc process, by the second year the university had created the University Promotion and Review Committee (UPRC) to conduct a procedural review of the process, quality, and fairness of the individual reviews, and to provide the provost with a written report of its assessment. The initial UPRC included tenured faculty from NSSR, as well as newly tenured faculty promoted in the ad hoc year. Divisional promotion committees, based on the one at NSSR, were established in each of the other divisions. Parallel to the review process for faculty being reviewed for tenure or EE by the UPRC, the provost created the University Term Review Committee (UTRC) to review all RTA reviews, so as to ensure that equity and fairness are followed at every step of the RTA review process.

Faculty members undergoing tenure or EE review demonstrate a high success rate. Of the 147 terminal reviews held between 2007 and 2012, only six were unsuccessful and eight led to a change of employment track. Generally, the track change option has been applied only to those faculty members who were teaching at the university prior to the introduction of the 2006 Handbook, and it required a specific and formal request from a dean to the provost.

The number of unsuccessful reviews is greater for those hired after 2006; of the six unsuccessful reviews, four were of those hired after 2006. Of the six, two persons were categorized as white and four were categorized as being one or more minority categories. While the numbers are too small to suggest any pattern, the university is paying particular attention to the review outcomes of minority faculty and weighing strategies for support. This includes the university’s mentoring program for minority faculty and a yearly dossier preparation workshop for all faculty members. By the end of spring 2013, more than 75 (one-third) of all of the eligible full-time tenure or EE faculty had attended one of the dossier preparation workshops held annually since 2007.
Part-Time Faculty: Reappointments and Promotion Reviews

When PTF members reach their 11th semester of teaching, they become what is referred to as “Annual” faculty, meaning that chairs and directors of academic programs are obligated to assign a minimum number of teaching hours each academic year (the base-load obligation is detailed below). PTF members who achieve this status are expected to be highly respected teachers with positive classroom experiences and have an established professional rapport with students, colleagues, and administrative staff alike.

The ACT–UAW contract requires that PTF who apply for advertised full-time positions and who meet the advertised qualifications be interviewed. This provision is designed to assist PTF in efforts to attain a FTF position at the university.

Full-Time Faculty: Annual Reports

Prior to 2010, policies concerning annual faculty self-reports and evaluations of FTF varied significantly, both between and within divisions. Starting in 2010–2011, an online application, initially developed in-house for use by Lang and NSSR, was introduced to all FTF regardless of employment category or rank. This system involves a four-part process that includes

1. Faculty members completing an online self-report that documents and comments on their teaching, research/creative/professional practices, and service in the prior year; reflections on successes and areas for growth; and goals for the following year
2. Supervisors reviewing and commenting on self-reports, adding assessments of online course ratings
3. Faculty members discussing supervisors’ comments in face-to-face, one-on-one meetings
4. Both parties having an opportunity to edit reports based on their face-to-face conversations before submitting final documents electronically

Although the process is now standardized, overall completion rates remain uneven and practices vary by division. The Provost’s Office is in the process of vetting possible alternatives to the current homegrown system by identifying commercial software that would simplify the process overall and enhance the university’s ability to collect important data regarding its faculty.

Part-Time Faculty: Classroom Observations and Chairs’ Reports

Additional evaluation methods, such as classroom observations, are available for courses taught by part-time faculty. Evaluations of PTF are considered an important tool for management; they are used to identify effective teaching styles, establish and maintain expectations for the PTF, and determine which PTF will be offered Annual appointments. The CBAs from Local 802 and Local 7902 do not place restrictions on when or how a PTF member may be evaluated during the first four semesters of employment (i.e., during the probationary period). Once a faculty member

---

24 The blank reports and results from 2011-2012 are in Appendix 3.X.
25 NSSR had both a high rate of completion of the self-reports (82.1 percent in 2010–2011, and 80.3 percent in 2011–2012) and decisions by reviewers to not complete the reviews. All completion data is available in Appendix 3.X.
26 Annual appointments are offered to select PTF at the start of their 11th semester at The New School, after having successfully taught for four probationary semesters, followed by seven postprobationary semesters.
becomes postprobationary (semesters five through ten), however, the contracts stipulates that the university may not evaluate that instructor more than once every three years, and it must conduct a fairly specific evaluation process using standard forms available on the Labor Relations Webpage.  

**Course Evaluations**

In 2008, The New School made efforts to move to a uniform course evaluation system. The Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) Center’s evaluation system was identified as a possible solution, so IDEA Center forms were piloted in more than 100 courses across the university in fall 2008 and spring 2009. Feedback from this pilot indicated that many faculty were opposed to the IDEA evaluations; in particular, many faculty did not find them to be appropriate for courses in arts and design, which make up the majority of courses at The New School.

In September 2009, the Provost's Office convened an ad hoc Committee on Student Ratings, which included one FTF and one PTF member of the UFS, to survey the current system and to make recommendations. This group presented “Recommendations for Student Ratings of Instruction at The New School” to the UFS, which analyzed the 17 different forms that had been distributed in 2008–2009 throughout the university and documented the various ways the forms were handled (e.g., whether faculty had access to their evaluations, whether quantitative data was calculated, who reviewed the results). The committee recommended that a university-wide form be established based on software provided by EvalKit and that it be administered to students online; two divisions piloted online evaluations in spring 2010. The online system was expanded to four divisions and several university-wide programs in spring 2011, and implemented in all courses at The New School starting in fall 2011.

The university has continued to improve this new system through modifications and to increase response rates. In fall 2012, software modifications permitted faculty to create customized questions that can be added to the standard form. In spring 2013, students’ ability to see course grades was connected to their completion of the forms. Response rates have risen but remain below the desirable level. The system has been an improvement in providing most faculty and staff with prompt, easily usable qualitative and quantitative feedback; after grades are submitted, course evaluations are made available to all instructors and their supervisors via the university-wide Learning Management System (LMS; see chapter 2).

**SECTION V: SHARED FACULTY GOVERNANCE**

This section elaborates from chapter 1 on the critical role played by the UFS, and the university’s faculty more generally, in helping to address the issues associated with the widespread dissatisfaction with the leadership of The New School from late 2008 through spring 2009. The faculty’s role in the resolution of serious institutional conflicts was a milestone for shared faculty governance.

---

27 Postprobationary and more senior faculty may be reviewed/observed more than once every three years when circumstances, such as a poor performance review, may require additional reviews/observations. The evaluation process is outlined in Appendix 3.IV.

28 The recommendations are in Appendix 3.XI.
governance at The New School. While the university administration’s genuine aspiration to
develop a robust culture of faculty governance is shared by all the divisions, there are differences
in divisional practices, which are the result of both the relative newness of shared faculty
governance and the historical differences that existed among the seven divisions.

After the dismissal of Provost Joseph Westphal in early December 2008, who was the third provost
to leave this office within two years, the UFS discussed and passed five “statements of concern”
related to the hiring and firing of provosts and President Kerrey’s decision to appoint himself as
interim provost and chief academic officer. The two UFS co-chairs subsequently convened a
meeting of the university’s senior faculty. After a near-unanimous vote of “no-confidence” on
December 10, 2008, and similar votes of no-confidence the following week by each of the
divisional full-time faculties, the UFS authorized its co-chairs to work with the deans to establish
an internal search process for a new interim provost, as well as to draft a strongly worded
“Minimum Requirements” document that outlined a substantial increase in the administrative
capacity and budgetary authority of the Provost’s Office. The President’s Office and the Board
accepted these minimum requirements, and this action was followed by the establishment of a
series of important committees, including one on Space and Facilities and another on Socially
Responsible Investment, each with substantial faculty and student representation.

The UFS also played an active role during the events of April 10, 2009, surrounding the
occupation of one of the university’s buildings. President Kerrey’s request for intervention by the
New York City police led to violent confrontations, injuries, and the suspension of some students.
The UFS, with the Board Trustees, created an independent fact-finding committee, which worked
with student leaders, the deans, the provost, and representatives of the President’s Office to
determine what happened, why it happened, and what actions the Board should take in response to
this event’s outcomes.

Shared faculty governance has been instituted through an evolving network of university,
divisional, and departmental committees made up of The New School faculty members. These
include

- Provost’s Office committees, such as the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), which
  coordinates with the UFS’ Faculty Affairs Sub-Committee and divisional deans in the
development of White Papers on university-wide faculty-related matters
- Divisional Advisory Councils, comprising elected executive or principal faculty who work
directly with their divisional deans on academic and budgetary concerns
- Appointed faculty who work directly with department or program heads to establish and
  oversee curricular development and practice

For example, as noted above, all divisions have instituted faculty advisory councils. However,
these currently vary in nomenclature, size, membership, and procedural formats. The number of
council members on these bodies tends to reflect the size of the divisional faculty; however, actual
membership is constituted solely by FTF in some cases, includes PTF in other cases, and in one
division (NSSR) includes students. Work to align governance practices across the

---

29 Appendix P.I
30 A list of university-wide committees is in Appendix 2.III; the UFS subcommittees and membership are on the web.
31 The white paper “Faculty Policy Development Process” is in Appendix 3.XII.
divisions—while acknowledging differences in divisional size, administrative and faculty profiles, pedagogical practices, and so on—is ongoing. The 2013 *Handbook* and the Faculty Affairs Committee’s work on developing guidelines for divisional supplements will be important shared resources for the seven divisions to help regularize nomenclature, membership, and procedures for shared faculty governance.

Given its history, The New School is especially attentive to and vigilant of academic freedom, and its faculty plays the lead role in safeguarding this value. For example, the UFS and other faculty leaders were insistent that the university learn from the student occupation in April 2009, leading to the development of a new policy on demonstrations. The UFS, as well as other structures for faculty participation in governance and consultation, has helped embed academic freedom protections across the institution. The sheer growth of the number of full-time faculty in recent years increases the base of this support.

**SECTION VI: TEACHING AND CURRICULAR OVERSIGHT**

**Teaching Workload**

A large majority of full-time faculty are contractually obligated to teach five courses per academic year, although the definition of what constitutes a course (or course equivalent) varies by division and, sometimes, by program.\(^{32}\) Exceptions, beyond the ones established in contract negotiations, include that faculty at NSSR teach four courses (with the fifth course released on the assumption that faculty members are engaged in instructional activities as members or chairs of MA or PhD committees). Some faculty members who teach studio or performance classes are also assigned fewer than five courses.

The New School is working to establish accepted equivalences for different kinds of teaching (e.g., seminar, lecture, studio, performance) and to regularize the situations in which faculty are released from courses in order to take on advising, administrative, and other responsibilities. To this end, some divisions have convened workload task forces that have produced recommendations, and the university commissioned a research brief titled “Faculty Workload and Supplemental Pay Policies.” Additionally, the Provost’s Office has worked with the associate deans to collect information on existing policies and practices, in order to institute new guidelines and policies regularizing course releases and supplemental pay across the university.\(^{33}\)

Processes for determining which courses faculty members will teach varies with the curricular goals and needs of specific programs. However, interviews conducted with representatives of divisional deans’ offices in December 2012 indicated that, in most cases, course assignments are made at the program or department level, with the relevant chairs or directors working with faculty to match courses to expertise and interest.

With PTF, chairs and directors are responsible for making assignments within their programs and departments in accordance with the appropriate union contract. After determining what courses should be offered by PTF and establishing qualifications for those courses, chairs and directors

\(^{32}\)See *Handbook* (2013: 10).

\(^{33}\)Both documents are in Appendix 3.XIII
first identify which PTF members are qualified to teach which courses, and then offer the assignments to qualified senior faculty first. If, after all the courses are assigned, there are not enough courses available within the program or department where a PTF member has traditionally taught, the search for courses to meet that faculty member’s base load must be widened, and may extend to the entire course offerings of the university. Once Annual, grandparented, and multiyear PTF are assigned courses to meet their base loads, program and department chairs and directors may assign PTF without base loads (i.e., probationary and postprobationary faculty) available courses.

Graduate Student Teaching

The conditions of employment for The New School graduate students serving in most instructional capacities have been standardized since 2008–2009, when oversight of graduate student teaching was first centralized in the Provost’s Office. Prior to 2008, graduate student teaching was managed by the divisions, which offered varied job descriptions, pay rates ranging from $11–$20/hour, and assorted levels of pedagogical support. Currently, with the exception of the Teaching Assistants (TA) assigned to NSSR, all TAs and Teaching Fellows (TF) are supervised by the Provost Office’s. In 2009–2010, the university instituted a uniform pay rate. The rate increases and the uniform policy were issues for which there was strong student advocacy.

The Provost’s Office coordinates the assignment process for these employment categories. Calls for TF applications are circulated university-wide in the fall semester and calls for TA applications are circulated in the spring semester. The timing coincides with the university’s course-building schedule: TF appointments are determined while departments are planning offerings for the following year; TA positions are assigned after departments have completed faculty assignments and estimated enrollments. The Provost’s Office disseminates all relevant applications to individual departments and programs, which select TAs and TFs in consultation with the Provost’s Office. Under the leadership of the Provost’s Office, the TA and TF programs have grown rapidly. Between 2008–2009 and 2011–2012, the number of students working as TAs rose from 92 to 181 (a nearly 97 percent increase), and the number of students serving as TFs grew from 48 to 93 (a nearly 94 percent change).

Institutional Support for Teaching

A wide variety of funds, workshops, and other forms of instructional support have been established in recent years. In the Provost’s Office, the Curriculum and Learning Office, created in 2010, has become a major hub of such resources. It regularly sponsors or cosponsors workshops on
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34 Additionally, Lang granted tuition remissions upon request.
35 TAs are graduate students who assist in course delivery and serve as apprentices under the supervision of the instructor(s) for a course. TFs are PhD candidates who serve as the instructors of record, with independent responsibility for a course. TFs do not teach graduate courses.
36 In 2009–2010, the pay rate for TAs was set at $25/hour, and TF compensation was raised from $3,000 to $5,000 per course. In 2012–2013, both categories received 10 percent wage increases: TFs now receive $5,500 per course and TAs earn between $1,238 (for appointments requiring three hours of work per week) and $4,125 (ten hours/week). Tuition remission is no longer offered.
37 See Appendix 3.XIV for documentation of the evolution of TA/TF policy, and tables on headcount and demographic information.
topics in pedagogy and learning, and it has a growing web presence, including the Resources for Teaching webpage, the Teaching Learning blog, and links offering guidance on topics including “Designing a Course” and “Assessment of Student Learning.” Starting in 2010, Curriculum and Learning has also overseen the Innovations in Education Fund (IEF), a faculty-development grant program that “provides support for New School faculty in their work as innovators in the areas of curriculum and pedagogy.” The fund, which is open to all FTF and postprobationary PTF, provides awards up to $10,000. It particularly seeks projects that advance priorities closely tied to the university’s mission and vision, including, among other objectives, “opportunities concerning diversity and social justice…[and] integrating the arts across the university.” The fund has disbursed between five and seven grants in each of the past three years, with amounts ranging from $5,000 to $10,000, and with all but one of the awards going to teams of two or more faculty members.38

TAs and TFs have also begun to receive greater and more targeted support from the Provost’s Office, with detailed information on the Graduate Student Teaching Program webpage. Prior to 2006–2007, graduate students serving in instructional roles participated in “brown bag” discussions of pedagogy. However, oversight of TAs and TFs was centralized in the Provost’s Office, and information is now easily available on the webpage Information for Students. Oversight grew both richer and more formal, with an annual orientation and an “Introduction to Teaching Workshop” held every August, and a noncredit pedagogy seminar that is offered every semester. All TAs and TFs are required to complete the seminar during the first year of their appointments.39

Various offices around the university also offer pedagogical support that complements the Provost’s Office offerings. For example, divisional dean’s offices (particularly at Parsons and NSPE) and ad hoc groups of interdivisional faculty organize workshops and training sessions on topical issues. Recent events have focused on subjects that include encouraging active learning in large-format classes, incorporating external partnerships into coursework (see Fund for Collaborative Innovation webpage), and teaching interdivisional populations. Additionally, both the University Learning Center (ULC), previously called the University Writing Center, and The New School Libraries & Archives (TNSLA) offer instruction sessions for classes, as well as handouts and other instructional materials.40

Curricular Oversight

Throughout the university, formalized structures ensure that faculty members are deeply involved in crafting and overseeing the curriculum. Along with academic administrators, faculty members are appointed to the Provost’s Office’s standing University Curriculum Committee (UCC) and to Divisional Curriculum Committees. Divisional Curriculum Committees meet for purposes such as vetting proposals for new courses of study, identifying existing or potential curricular failings and

38 These funds are discussed further in chapter 5.
39 The NSSR TAs are not required to take part in the Provost’s Office TA/TF pedagogical support. The assumption is that the high-level, highly discipline-specific work done by the NSSR TAs is of a different character, and those TAs should be getting a higher level of support from the faculty.
40 See chapters 2 and chapter 5 for further discussion concerning the TNSLA and the ULC.
opportunities, recommending methods for assessing and improving the quality of course offerings, and more, as discussed in chapter 5.

Perceptions

Preliminary results of the COACHE survey suggest that, overall, full-time faculty are happier with the “nature of work—teaching” than with any other benchmark; for the 251 respondents who answered related questions, the mean score given to teaching was 3.82 (on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being highest). However, a closer look at specific questions points to divisional differences that might prove to be significant. For example, while 79 percent of tenured and tenure-track faculty at NSSR and 76 percent of tenure-track faculty at Parsons report being “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the “number of courses taught,” only 43 percent of the tenure-track population at Lang agrees. These and other similar findings are still under discussion in terms of their implications, but will no doubt have some role to play in future policy and planning decisions regarding workload at the university.

Section VII: Service

Although many of the changes in the university’s academic and professional culture detailed throughout this chapter, such as increased job security and greater faculty empowerment, have been overwhelmingly positive, many of these developments appear to have contributed to an increase in both FTF service expectations and workload. Self-reported data (optionally reported) and faculty survey responses suggest that Parsons faculty experience their service responsibilities as having particularly ballooned, and that Parsons has undergone tremendous changes in structure, curriculum, and culture in the last few years. In contrast, anecdotal evidence suggests that PTF might be receiving fewer service assignments in response to their collective bargaining agreements, which prescribes specific levels of compensation for service activities and makes it more expensive to assign such tasks to PTF.

The deepened faculty participation in university governance, while a positive, is also producing real stressors related to service workloads and administrative needs. The increased participation has included planning major academic changes throughout The New School, such as curricular changes, development, and restructuring at two divisions. Other duties have included the creation of and participation on standing, administrative, ad hoc, university-wide, and divisional committees; participation on search committees during several years of extensive faculty hiring; and participation on new university and divisional faculty governance bodies.

While partly alleviated by newly hired FTF and the formal drafting of faculty into administrative roles, many faculty still regard their service loads as high. The introduction of tenure track appointments across the institution has created difficulties in ensuring service needs are met, as tenure track faculty must also have time to conduct scholarship and creative practices, and it has put particular pressure on senior faculty to take on service commitments. Additionally, junior faculty may feel overburdened by high demands for faculty service and administrative contributions. This is exacerbated by the imbalance of senior to junior faculty at some divisions.

41 A full analysis of COACHE responses can be found in Appendix 3.VII.
42 See chapter 5.
Data on faculty service activities have not been collected systematically and have only recently been collected (with service reporting optional) via the online Annual Faculty Self-Report. In 2012, faculty served on 17 university-wide committees. In addition, most divisions have one or more standing curriculum committees, as well as ad hoc or standing faculty review and promotion committees. The number, type, and composition of other committees vary by division and program, as do practices for selecting and compensating committee members, committee chairs, and faculty who serve as academic, thesis, or dissertation advisors.

The online Annual Faculty Self-Report (implemented in 2010–2011) enabled optional reporting of service activities for 2011–2012. Mindful that many would push back on what could be experienced or perceived as excessive demands, faculty were assured that the information would be used only in the aggregate and that reporting was entirely optional. Faculty had three options for reporting service: leave that section blank, indicate service activities but without assigning time spent, or indicate service activities with time spent. Of the 381 eligible FTF to complete the Annual Faculty Self-Report, 224 provided service entries, but only 148 faculty estimated time used for these service activities. Thus, the data is best understood as a partial and qualitative picture.

Nonetheless, faculty self-reports (subjective and qualitative as they are) and survey responses point to large variations in faculty experiences and perceptions of faculty service activities. Of the faculty members who elected to include estimates of their service workloads on the 2011–2012 annual report, those at Parsons reported devoting the largest amount of time on service (averaging 417 hours in the fall and spring semesters, combined), and those at Mannes reported the least amount of time (averaging 87 hours across the same period). Preliminary results of the COACHE survey affirm that Parsons faculty find their service workloads to be more onerous than faculty in other divisions. To consider only the extremes, when asked about “time spent on service,” 60 percent of tenured and tenure-track faculty at Parsons reported being “dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied,” while at Lang, only 32 percent of the same categories of faculty reported being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

SECTION VIII: RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE PRACTICE

Mechanisms of Support for Faculty Research since the Adoption of the Full-Time Faculty Handbook

Both the introduction of tenure as a possible track for faculty throughout the university and a greater voice for faculty in university governance has led to the development and implementation of a number of initiatives aimed to support and enhance faculty research, scholarship, and creative practice opportunities. In recent years, the university has implemented a more transparent and standard process for distributing research funds to faculty by providing two general sources: General Research Funding (which is a baseline amount per annum to all eligible faculty members), and Research/Student Assistant Funding. This latter fund supports and aligns all full-time faculty

---

43 See available aggregated data in Appendix 3.XV
44 Appendix 2.III contains a list of all standing committees.
45 The data can be found in Appendix 3.XV.
with the policy of NSSR, which historically employed tenure-track faculty who were reviewed and promoted largely on the basis of the quality and quantity of their published research.

In addition to these two sources, the Provost Office’s has expanded the number of its competitive internal grants programs into six distinct pools, two of which focus primarily on research project support: the Faculty Research Fund and the cross-divisional Research Clusters Initiative. The Faculty Research Fund supports faculty members in their work as scholars and creative practitioners to support new research-based, professional, or creative projects. The Research Clusters Initiative supports groups of three to seven faculty members from two or more divisions to engage in a collaborative research project that cuts across disciplines and academic domains. These two research-oriented grant programs are in addition to research support within some of the university’s divisions, as well as the Provost’s Office other competitive grant programs that faculty can apply for annually to support projects and initiatives focusing on pedagogy (Innovations in Education Fund), on-campus events (Academic Events Fund), faculty mentoring and development (Mutual Mentoring Grants), and sustainability and environmental-focused initiatives (The Green Fund).  

SECTION IX: THE FACULTY SURVEY—ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

The COACHE Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey administered in the 2012–2013 has provided preliminary data that will be important as the university continues to invest in and build a solid infrastructure for meeting faculty needs.

The survey was undertaken in part to begin to assess The New School’s progress and continuing challenges of its ambitious effort to transform the character and size of the FTF over this period through: offering tenure across the university and adopting university-wide policies regarding eligibility for academic leaves; clarifying and improving the status, privileges, and role of renewable-term faculty appointments; instituting common review and promotion policies and practices for all appointment types; insuring shared faculty governance and peer review in the development and application of all new faculty policies and practices; and insuring equitable and ecologically appropriate workload expectations across employment categories, programs, and divisions. The results provide some sources of encouragement as well as concern. One goal for the coming year will be to use the findings to inform deliberations about administrative and faculty priorities for improving faculty experiences across The New School.

Response Rates

A 63 percent response rate is a good first sign. This was reported to be above average for institutions of The New School’s size, setting, and mission. The faculty’s willingness to participate in the COACHE Survey is a strong indicator of their interest in discussing their experiences. Of concern is the lower response rate for faculty of color. It is not uncommon for faculty of color to respond at a lower rate than white faculty. However, compared with other institutions, the difference between response rates by race is greater at The New School.

46 See Appendix 3.XVI for more information on the Research Clusters and funding data. All applications and instructions are available on the Provost’s Office’s website.
Areas of Strength

Some individual survey dimensions where The New School’s faculty are more satisfied than their peers include satisfaction with

- Class size
- Budgetary support for interdisciplinary work
- Recognition from the Provost’s Office
- Recognition from their deans

The New School’s faculty also rated satisfaction with the quality of graduate students to support their research and their support for securing graduate students higher than faculty at other institutions. This follows the university’s recent extension of research budgets and eligibility to apply for research assistant funding to all principal FTF.

When asked to identify the best aspects of working at The New School, one-fourth of the faculty identified their sense of fit within the institution. This pattern holds true across rank, tenure status, gender, and race, which is not often the case at other institutions.

A final high note is the relative parity of experiences between men and women among The New School’s faculty. There is some variance between men and women in the way they experience faculty life, but the differences tend to be smaller than elsewhere.

Areas of Concern

Several areas of concern appear. The largest area of dissatisfaction relative to the comparison faculty is regarding tenure policies. Faculty are less clear, when compared to faculty at other institutions, about the process, criteria, standards, and body of evidence necessary to achieve tenure. Faculty are also somewhat less satisfied with the clarity of expectations for achieving tenure and the reasonableness of those expectations. Given the substantive changes recently made in this area, this finding is understandable, but also worthy of sustained attention. One particular data point worth noting is that nearly 70 percent of The New School’s pre-tenure faculty indicate that they have not received formal feedback on their progress toward tenure. Thus, while annual reviews are now mandated and designed to provide developmental moments, faculty do not experience this opportunity as providing adequate feedback. This applies equally to reappointment results, where similar patterns and concerns are seen.

Another area of concern is related to facilities and work resources. Faculty are less satisfied with library resources and laboratory, research, and studio space than faculty at other institutions. However, being in the heart of New York City offers great opportunities. Nearly half of the respondents to the COACHE Survey identified the geographic location as a best aspect of working at The New School. However, many faculty identified cost of living as a worst aspect. In addition, The New School faculty were markedly less satisfied than other faculty with the housing benefits.

Finally, faculty seem less satisfied with service load and its impingement on their ability to teach and conduct research. As budgets constrict, faculty service work has become code for replacing support staff. This is an area The New School is committed to revisiting in the coming year.
SECTION X: RECOMMENDATIONS

• Assess and improve the utilization and effectiveness of current resources for supporting professional growth and advancement of faculty, particularly with regard to the mentoring of junior faculty.
CHAPTER 4: STUDENTS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the resources, policies, and procedures employed by the university to recruit, retain, and support its student body, and to ensure that the profiles of admitted students are consistent with its mission and vision statement. The chapter also documents the methods by which student-directed services are strategically and selectively deployed to maximize student success at various points along the admission-to-graduation sequence.

Changes in admissions practices and student services that have occurred over the last decade are also addressed, particularly in response to the remarkable 29 percent increase in total credit-seeking enrollments between 2002 and 2012. The rationale for this intentional expansion, as well as its reevaluation and eventual discontinuation, are discussed in some detail in chapter 2, and so will not be revisited here. However, the extended period of rapid enrollment growth has had a number of ripple effects in areas such as student services and financial aid. How these challenges have been dealt with—some more successfully than others—are discussed in the subsequent sections of this chapter.

SECTION I: RECRUITMENT, ADMISSIONS, AND ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

Administrative Structure: History and Overview

Given the heterogeneous mix of divisions and programs of The New School and its heavy reliance on tuition revenue, the task of identifying and recruiting students that best match the mission and vision of the university and its constituent divisions has always been a challenge. Prior to 2005, each of the then-eight academic divisions had its own admissions office responsible for the recruitment and operations of new student enrollments. However, in 2005, the admissions function was centralized under the direction of a newly created position, the Assistant Vice President for University Admission, for both efficiency and to move toward the “one university” model. This position reported to the Senior Vice President for Student Services and was the leader of a team of admission directors responsible for the implementation of recruitment strategies and operations to manage the admission pipeline.

In an effort to create even greater efficiencies, in 2007 the university created the position of Vice President for Enrollment Management, which brought together four formerly separate administrative units: Admission, Enrollment Operations, Student Financial Services (Financial Aid and the Bursar), and the Registrar. In 2012, Enrollment Management acquired Marketing and Career Services; in 2013, Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) was created to seamlessly bring together marketing, admission, enrollment systems, and financial aid.

Through a collaborative, multi-stakeholder approach that includes the Provost’s Office, Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE), Finance and Business, and the academic divisions,

---

1 See Table 2-2 in The New School Fact Book 2012, Enrollment trends since 2003 can be found Appendix 2.I.
2 A Strategic Enrollment Management Organizational Chart can be found in Appendix 1.IV.
SEM directs the planning and implementation of strategies for recruiting best-fit students across the university and ensures that recruitment goals remain aligned with student quality expectations and the university’s mission. SEM is therefore primarily responsible for:

- Creating and implementing marketing and recruitment strategies for prospective domestic and international students
- Creating and implementing admission policies and procedures
- Creating financial aid strategies and models for new and current domestic and international students
- Implementing systems and technologies designed to manage admission pipeline activities
- Managing and reporting admission pipeline data

**Prospective Students: Information Access and Communication**

Ongoing marketing activities conducted by SEM are designed to complement face-to-face recruitment activities that typically occur from September through December. In order to reach the application goals for the university and its programs, the strategies employed are necessarily multichannel (i.e., face-to-face, electronic, and print delivery) reflecting the many methods prospective students communicate with and learn about university communities. The primary marketing and recruitment channels of inquiry and applicant cultivation are the university website, popular social media sites (Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, etc.), domestic and international recruiting activities (i.e., portfolio reviews, college fairs), email and print communications, custom brochures, online information sessions, telephone calls, on-campus visits (tours, interviews, open houses), and special events.

In addition to marketing materials created by SEM, college-bound students have access to many New School resources. For example, the prospective student and admissions landing pages on the university’s website aggregate an array of useful information for prospective students and their families to learn about degree programs, affordability, and other services that may be helpful to determine fit. From the university website, prospective and current students can easily access financial aid information and tools (e.g., Net Price Calculator) to assist with tuition planning and information regarding university housing. Communication and External Affairs, working with the Provost’s Office, ensures that all information provided through these various modes of communication is factually accurate and comprehensive enough to allow prospective students to make informed decisions.

**Prospective Students: The Application Review Process**

Admission counseling, application material processing, and financial aid packaging are priorities from January through April, when application materials are reviewed, admission rankings are determined for denial or acceptance, and financial aid decisions determined. An obvious goal of this phase is not only to make admission decisions in a timely manner but also to admit the requisite number and mix of prospective students that will produce a yield that is consistent with the university’s enrollment goals.

---

3 Yield: The percentage of admitted students that matriculate. The relevant data on the admission results across the university can be found in Appendix 4.I. An Application Requirements Matrix is available in Appendix 4.II. This matrix defines what constitutes a complete application.
Beginning in mid-February, acceptance letters are sent via email and regular mail to admitted students. At this time of year, financial aid offers and scholarships are communicated to admitted students with the acceptance letters or shortly thereafter. As prospective students move through this phase of the pipeline, multichannel recruitment and retention methods continue and students are introduced to the university portal (MyNewSchool) ENGAGE, and Grad CONNECT (private social network sites), and to the campus through visitations, on- and off-campus yield events, interviews, and academic advising. During the latter phases of the admission pipeline, admission counselors complete transfer credit evaluations (TCEs) for admitted and deposited transfer students. TCE results are communicated to transfer students to help with final college choice decisions and financial aid packaging. Furthermore, yield and summer melt strategies are introduced after April and continue through August to manage the final phases of a recruitment cycle.4

**Enrollment and Student Profiles**

In 2012, 6,775 undergraduates, 3,565 graduates, and 235 general credit students were enrolled at The New School. Several facts stand out about the university’s student composition. Forty-eight percent of the student body is enrolled in the design school, Parsons.5 Additionally, and in keeping with the global and international emphasis in its mission, The New School has the highest percentage of international degree-seeking undergraduates of all national universities over the last six years.6 In 2012, 29 percent of the university’s degree-seeking undergraduates and 27 percent of the overall student body were international students. In the same year, the university enrolled students from 108 different countries (and from every state in the United States).7 These two aspects of the student profile are related. At Parsons, as a leading design school internationally with a New York City location, international students comprise 36 percent of undergraduates and 32 percent of graduate students. Students from Asia have been a major component. In 2012, Korean students were the single largest international student group in the university (20 percent in fall 2012), followed by China at 9 percent.

In terms of ethnic, racial, and economic diversity, goals that strongly resonate with the traditions and mission of the university, there is ample evidence to indicate The New School has had some success in recruiting and enrolling individuals from a wide range of economic and cultural backgrounds. In 2012, 41 percent of the university’s domestic students who provided information about their ethnicity were from an underrepresented ethnic group. However, there is a case to be made that the university has been more successful in attracting and enrolling students from some ethnic groups as opposed to others (e.g., Asian American in comparison to African American students).9 Nonetheless, once students from underrepresented groups enroll in an undergraduate four-year program, their retention rates over one year, regardless of ethnicity, is comparable or better than that of white students in the same cohort.10

---

4 Summer melt: The percentage of deposited students that do not matriculate.
5 See Table 2-1 in The New School Fact Book 2012.
7 See Table 2-6 in The New School Fact Book 2012.
9 As evidenced in Table 2-4 of The New School Fact Book 2012.
10 See Table 3-1 in The New School Fact Book 2012.
In 2011, 27 percent of undergraduates who entered a four-year program were Pell grant recipients. Moreover, in 2012, 74 percent of all undergraduates received some form of financial aid. Maintaining this level of financial support in the context of the current economic climate has not been without its challenges (see chapter 2). Additional discussion of financial aid appears below in Section III.

**Enrollment and Best Fit**

Because of the diverse nature of The New School’s academic programs and its urban campus setting, the types of students that are actively recruited and ultimately admitted vary considerably by program and division. Information about the admission requirements, program goals, and the types of students that the university’s programs seek to enroll is made available to all prospective students through a variety of sources, including The New School’s Admissions webpage, and the university printed catalogs.

**SECTION II: STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES**

Once an admitted student concludes that the desired program of study is a good match and decides to attend, the university is obligated and committed to maximize the student’s chances of successfully completing the program and achieving his or her academic and/or professional goals. These outcomes are not possible without an appropriate mix of student support services that are both accessible and consistent with the needs of a highly diverse student body. The following sections describe the university’s student support services in relation to student retention and other important outcomes, such as student satisfaction. Where appropriate, this chapter also discusses the impact that the period of rapid enrollment growth had on the provision of specific services and the adjustments that were made to mitigate any negative effects on retention.

Like most large, urban universities, The New School provides a wide range of student support services to enrolled students. For the sake of space, this section will focus on only a few of these services with a detailed overview.

**The Transition from Admitted to Enrolled**

The university has a variety of services designed to insure that newly admitted students have a smooth and productive orientation in their first year. After admission, first-year students are connected through the Ning network via Admissions. This online community helps new students make friends, learn about the university, and interact with key admissions staff. In summer 2012, a coaching project to minimize “summer melt” was piloted for first-year Eugene Lang College The
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11 A Federal Pell Grant is a grant that the U.S. federal government provides for students based on financial need who have not earned their first bachelor's degree
12 See Tables 3-1, 3-2, 3-3, and 5-8 in *The New School Fact Book 2012*.
13 See the Application Requirements Matrix for a list of items that complete the applications for the review process by program; the matrix can be found in Appendix 4.II.
14 The New School’s catalogs are online and can in Appendix 5.IX.
15 A detailed overview of the full range of the university’s student services is in Appendix 4.III.
16 A description of the university’s orientation activities, the most recent year of orientation materials, and Experience+Meaning, a required academic component of orientation, are available in Appendix 4.IV.
New School for Liberal Arts (Lang) students. Staff members maintained contact with newly admitted students, answering questions and providing appropriate referrals (e.g., Student Financial Services; Academic Advising). The program was expanded in summer 2013 to include all newly admitted undergraduates at the university, and the staff coaches were replaced with peer mentors.

Financial Aid

In 2012, the average total financial aid awarded per student (undergraduate and graduate students, combined) was $22,815, with approximately 74 percent of students receiving some type of yearly financial aid in the form of scholarships, grants, work-study, or loans. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that despite the recent economic downturn, 72 percent more students at The New School received financial aid awards in 2011 than in 2006, far outstripping the enrollment growth for the same period. Moreover, the total value of the financial aid awards that were made for the same period increased by 85 percent, unadjusted for inflation. In the absence of a large endowment, the capacity to maintain these levels of financial support could not exist without many of the recent budgetary and administrative changes that are described in chapters 1 and 2. There is general agreement, however, that for both recruitment and retention, the average level of financial support is less than ideal. This is perhaps most dramatically the case in the university’s doctoral programs, for which the level of student support and the numbers that are fundable puts the university at a disadvantage in relation to its peers.

Finding better and more effective ways to provide students with financial aid information has been a priority. For example, in response to assessed student need, a call center was established to handle basic financial aid questions. Counselors are now available for more detailed and student-specific information. Inquiries can be made by phone, email, instant messaging, and in-person, and are responded to within 24 hours. The Financial Aid department has also strengthened working relationships with the various divisions at the university to address school-specific aid issues (e.g., merit-based scholarships), and has used the results to improve its services.

Student Advising

Academic advising falls into two categories: formal assignment of a faculty and/or professional advisor from divisional Advising to assist with course selection and degree progress; and informal guidance and mentorship by faculty and staff, often enabled by small class sizes, to help students with an assortment of concerns.

The models for delivering advising services vary at the university, but most implement some shared structure that incorporates both targeted academic advising to assist students in course registration, degree requirements, and so forth (through assigned faculty and/or staff), and general programming (through a centralized divisional office) to provide information about study abroad

---

17 Financial aid includes need-based and merit-based grants, federal grants, state grants, federal student loans, private student loans, federal parent loans, and federal work-study. A complete audit is available in Appendix 2.IV.
18 See Table 5-8 in The New School Fact Book 2012.
19 Information regarding Student Financial Services (SFS) is available on the SFS website and a summary of the customer service assessment survey and screen image captures of the current survey are in Appendix 4.V.
and other academic options. Students in dual-degree programs, including the BA/BFA five-year degree programs between Lang/Parsons and Lang/Jazz, and the bachelor/master programs offered at Lang, The New School for Social Research (NSSR), and The New School for Public Engagement (NSPE) receive advising from both degree areas.

Services offered through Advising include course selection and registration, graduation audits, determination of transfer credits, referrals to academic resources, administrative support for experiential programs (including study abroad, internships, civic engagement), and graduation and award ceremonies. As a consequence of the decentralization of advising services, there is variation in assigned caseloads for both faculty and staff advisors across the divisions; and some programs have more reliance on professional staff for advising.

In fall 2011, the Provost’s Office created a working group on Academic Advising to gather information about the distribution of student advising services among faculty and staff and to make recommendations. The resulting spring 2012 report summarizes the services offered by each division and highlights the differences in student-to-advisor ratios among programs and divisions.20 Of particular note are the large ratios in a small number of BFA programs at Parsons, and BA programs Lang. It also notes the inclusion of peer advisors in the first-year program at Lang and among graduate students at NSSR.

The report’s recommendations include ongoing work to integrate online registration and advising resources for more seamless use by students, faculty, and staff; the development of a more systematic identification system and quicker response to students who are struggling academically; and the establishment of a working group to articulate advising goals and objectives and to assess the advising structure and roles of faculty, professional, and peer advisors based on those goals.

Currently, Strategic Enrollment Management is in the process of addressing the recommendations. The online university course catalog now provides a searchable resource to look for courses across all divisions of The New School, and efforts are being made to coordinate advising activities through the degree audit program DegreeWorks, which was implemented in fall 2012. In fall 2012, The New School also piloted the Student Success Network (utilizing a retention management platform from Starfish) to address the retention task force’s recommendation regarding at-risk students. For more information about both DegreeWorks and Starfish, see the section of this chapter regarding retention.

Finally, the Provost’s Office established the University Advisor Forum (UAF), which comprises the directors of advising from across the institution and administrators or faculty whose primary responsibilities relate to advising. The UAF convenes monthly to discuss policies and procedures, share best practices, note potential improvements to university-wide advising services, and resolve issues. With the appointment of the new Vice President for Student Success in fall 2013, the UAF will be transferred under her authority.

---

20 The report can be found in Appendix 4.VI.
Student Housing and Residence Life

Historically, and despite its large number of international and nonresident students, most students at The New School do not reside in university housing. While most undergraduate and graduate students who have attended the university for at least a year prefer to live independently within New York City and its environs, first-year students are encouraged to live in the university’s residence halls, and many do. In fall 2012, nearly 70 percent of first-time freshmen chose to live in a residence hall. Of the total student body, 16.5 percent chose residence hall living. For those who reside off-campus, the university maintains an informational site to assist students in finding apartments to lease, sublet, or share. For those residing on-campus, the university offers a full residence life program. In fall 2013, the university opened a residence hall in the top eight floors of the new University Center (UC). With this opening, the university can house nearly 2,000 students within walking distance of the Greenwich Village campus. This will be the first time in the university’s history that all the dormitories are within walking distance of campus, and it is an important accomplishment for an urban university where the psychological demarcation of a “campus” from its surrounding environs can often prove to be elusive.

Focusing on first-time freshman, the residence halls are considered an integral part of the university’s student development program, rather than just a place to live. The residential staff work together to provide 24/7 emergency on-call coverage and to create strong residential communities that focus on shared commitment and personal growth. Meaningful hall programs provide students with activities and opportunities to explore the city, including museums, concerts, lectures, films, cooking classes, and intramural sports. The halls are governed through a multi-tier system, where hall staff can provide guidance and direction to student-led Residence Hall Councils, and the RA Advisory Committee gives students a voice in the decision-making processes regarding programming, training, and operational issues. Recently, Student Housing and Residence Life instituted a number of new initiatives in response to student requests stemming from both the RA Advisory Committee and from discussions with residents during floor meetings. These include the creation of gender-neutral housing, and focused community living opportunities around health and wellness, music, international global village, sustainable environments, social justice, and academic honors.

The effectiveness of existing and newly implemented initiatives was first assessed in the ACT student satisfaction survey, administered in 2012. In this first administration, students reported being average satisfaction with residence hall staff responsiveness and residence rules and regulation. Additionally, in comparison to its urban and nonurban peers, The New School respondents to the survey were significantly more satisfied with personal security/safety at the institution. However, students reported having below average satisfaction with residence hall services and programs compared to peer institutions. These results will provide a baseline against which the effectiveness of new initiatives can be assessed. However, ACT had discontinued the survey so future assessment of satisfaction in Housing and Residence Life and the effectiveness of the programs will be assessed with a self-developed survey to be administered every two years.

---

21 See Table 5-9 in The New School Fact Book 2012.
22 Descriptions, housing contracts, and housing rates are available on the Student Housing and Residence Life website and in Appendix 4.VII. The dorm locations are also listed on the campus map.
23 Results from the ACT survey and the NSSE survey results are in Appendix 4.VIII and Appendix 4.IX respectively.
The Higher Education Opportunity Program

The New School has been involved with New York State’s Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP) for more than 30 years. The program was designed to expand educational opportunities in independent colleges and universities. It affords access to New York state residents who, because of academic and economic circumstances, would otherwise be unable to attend a postsecondary educational institution. It also furthers the institution’s goals to be both ethnically and socioeconomically diverse, reflecting the city in which it resides.

All admitted first-year HEOP students attend a six-week intensive summer precollege program. By attending rigorous courses and co-curricular and social events and activities, students hone their academic skills, receive individualized tutoring and personal coaching, and are encouraged to bond with staff and peers. The summer precollege program prepares students for the classroom, and instills confidence and a sense of community. The program keeps an open dialogue with other support staff, academic advisors, and faculty from around the university that work with students in the program to ensure that they are receiving clear, consistently delivered information and support.

The program builds the cohort group(s) by working to address issues specific to their academic profile and needs while each HEOP student, as a member of the larger student body, is encouraged to take advantage of the many activities offered by the university at large. Throughout their time at the university, HEOP students receive individualized tutoring and personalized coaching by dedicated staff members who stress the value of peer support and mentoring. The staff invites students to work with each other in both formal and informal settings. Data and additional program information, including retention, is reported to via several mediums and methods.24

International Student Support Services

Over the last ten years, the international student population at The New School has grown from 1,662 in 2002 to 2,776 in 2012, a change of 71 percent. As noted previously, the 2012 number represents 27 percent of the total student body, and marks the continuation of a multiyear trend: 7 percent increase in one year, 29 percent increase in over five years, and 81 percent increase over the 10 years. As also previously noted, The New School ranks first in the country for the highest percentage of international undergraduates. For students whose language skills are not sufficient to gain admission to Parsons or Mannes College The New School for Music (Mannes), The New School offers opportunities for students to register for intensive English as a Second Language (ESL) classes to help them matriculate.

Prior to 2009, The New School offered two programs designed to help ESL students enroll at Parsons: a year-round ESL certificate program run through NSPE; and the Summer Orientation Program for International Students (SOPIS), run through Parson’s Summer, Pre-College Academy, and Continuing Education SPACE. SOPIS was an eight-week intensive program for students who were conditionally accepted into Parsons’ BFA/AAS degree programs (upon successful completion of SOPIS). In 2009, the provost and the dean of Parsons began exploring

24 The HEOP Fact Sheet, HEOP Supplemental Admission Application, and can be found on the HEOP website and in Appendix 4.X. Additionally, retention date specific to HEOP is also in Appendix 4.X
more efficient and effective precollege ESL preparation for Parsons aspirants. The new ESL+Design (ESL+D) Certificate Program was launched in summer 2011. The program combines the former SOPIS program with orientation to university life, smoothing the transition from ESL student status to matriculated Parsons student status. In fall 2013, the program was extended to Mannes as the ESL+Music (ESL+M) Certificate Program. For more information, see chapter 5.

International Student Services (ISS) provides immigration advice and cultural support for students, faculty, staff, and other departments in a welcoming and friendly environment. ISS is involved in every aspect of the student lifecycle, from preadmission to postgraduation. ISS provides prospective and continuing students with advice and support from peer advisors on issues of cultural adjustment, racism, discrimination, succeeding in the U.S. higher education system, and immigration regulations. In addition to a presence on admissions platforms, such as Engage, ISS ambassadors, student workers, and advisors maintain contact with prospective and new incoming students through live chats, social media platforms (e.g., Facebook and Twitter), email, and via Skype. Students are welcomed at check-in and orientations designed specifically to address an international student’s needs. ISS staff also visits divisional orientations to ensure that students are aware of their services.

ISS has facilitated workshops and forums, such as the employment group, which brings together administrators from Career Development, Human Resources, ISS, and Financial Aid to assist students with employment issues. ISS also creates programming, such as the mentor program, conversation partners, and Fun Fridays, which not only supports students in their cultural adjustment but also provides opportunities for international and domestic students to exchange ideas in a productive dialogue. ISS is continually assessing the effectiveness of its services to students through surveys to students on aspects of service, evaluation forms for all workshops, and through feedback from students, including the International Student Advisory Board.25

Career Services

The enhancement of career services was one of President Van Zandt’s top priorities upon his arrival in January 2011. Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE) has undertaken a series of studies to assess the kinds of jobs that alumni receive shortly after graduating from The New School and whether they made use of career services in obtaining these jobs. In fall 2012, the Provost’s Office’s Task Force on Career Services was formed to make recommendations about how these services could be improved. Following the task force’s report, the new Senior Vice President for Enrollment Management and Career Services position was created.26 This position has been charged with improving career services for The New School students. This position will continue to find new and innovative approaches that go beyond traditional career services toward a holistic approach in preparing students for the dramatically shifting realities of career and work. This includes working in partnership with the General Assembly, a training and employment company that draws on their knowledge of the changing workplace and the needs of employers in the creative sectors, as well as the hiring of an expert in the Provost’s Office to develop curriculum that directly supports the transition to employment and careers. Parsons, NSSR, The New School for Drama (Drama), and the Milano School of International

25 Additional information on this service can be found on the ISS webpage and in Appendix 4.III.
26 The report and presentation can be found in Appendix 4.XI.
Affairs, Management, and Urban Policy each provide their own career services. Career Development, which was formed in 2002 and housed under Student Services, supports Lang, NSPE (excluding students at Milano), Mannes, and Jazz. It was designed to fill a gap in career services at the university, particularly for those divisions that previously did not have their own career services, and to help facilitate communication and partnerships among the various career service providers. During 2011–2012, Career Development provided more than 2,577 individual counseling sessions and various events for more than 3,363 attendees. By spring 2014, the office will offer career development services to all undergraduate students regardless of their home division. Graduate students at NSSR, Milano, and Parsons will still receive advisement from advisors located within their own programs.

The New School offers a variety of internship opportunities for students in which they can apply newly acquired knowledge from the classroom and gain experiences that add to their resumes and inform their postgraduation choices. In some instances, internships or field experience is required for program completion, which is further discussed in chapter 5. Intern programs are generally tailored around specific degree programs and thus vary from division to division. In academic year 2011–2012, 1,421 Parsons students and 119 Lang students availed themselves of internship services, which include endowed programs such as Lang’s “I Have a Dream” internship in academic year 2011–2012.

Support Services and Learning Outcomes

Not all students are equally prepared to successfully navigate the challenges associated with the university’s academic programs. In order to ensure that the university’s academic programs are effective in promoting learning outcomes that are consistent with its mission and goals, particularly with regard to those associated with the core competencies in writing, quantitative and scientific reasoning, and technology, a range of resources are utilized to identify and assist those students who are at risk of becoming unsuccessful learners.

An important and key resource in this regard is the University Learning Center (ULC), which provides to students in all divisions a variety of academic support services that are designed to improve skills in writing, mathematics/quantitative reasoning, and oral presentation. The ULC provides one-on-one tutoring sessions and a number of bi-weekly workshops, such as Structuring an Argument, Critical Thinking, and Writing with Authority.

In addition to students who might be underprepared in terms of the requisite skills needed to achieve certain learning outcomes and who receive services from the ULC, there are those students who by virtue of having various types of disabilities find themselves at a disadvantage in certain learning environments. In this regard, the Student Disability Services (SDS), a centralized office that provides programmatic and academic accommodations and services for students with disabilities across the university, plays a critical role in helping disabled students successfully achieve their learning outcomes. Since the time of the last review, SDS has significantly increased its service capacity and has moved to larger, better-resourced offices that include a testing center and an adaptive equipment lab.

27 For a more detailed overview of the full range of the services provided, see Appendix 4.III.
28 Ibid
The HEOP Program, discussed above, is another important resource that plays a vital role in maximizing learning outcome success for specific types of students. The program provides an opportunity for students to assess their level of preparedness in terms of the core academic competencies, and thus is a mechanism for identifying and planning for future and ongoing academic support needs.

Finally, as will be further explained in chapter 5, the unusually high percentage of international students in the university, particularly in the Parsons and Mannes divisions, necessitates ensuring that incoming students are adequately proficient in written and spoken English, as several of the core academic competencies presume the existence of this basic foundation. Particularly notable in this regard is the fact that in response to its outsized international applicant pool, Parsons offers conditional admission to students with lower-than-needed TOEFL scores, provided that they successfully complete an intensive English language instruction program.

SECTION III: RETENTION OF STUDENTS

While the importance of improving student retention is generally recognized, it remains a particular challenge for institutions like The New School, which has limited ability to offer need-based aid and has an operating budget that is particularly dependent on tuition-based revenue. In the last five years, the university-wide retention rate for first-time, first-year students has ranged from 78 percent to 83 percent; the six-year completion rate for undergraduate four-year programs has remained relatively stable, ranging from 61 percent to 66 percent. Although the first-year retention rate is four points higher than the national average retention rates for Private Doctoral/Research Universities, it is not as good as many of The New School’s peer institutions. However, there is considerable variation across divisions.29

In 2010, IRE administered a Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) survey to a group of first-year Parsons and Lang students to identify factors that correlated with retention.30 In exit interviews and other surveys, students cited a number of factors contributing to their decision to leave. These include academic or financial challenges, lack of desired program, high performance students transferring away, lack of employment opportunities on campus, and lack of social engagement or community. Many of these factors are common to other institutions, although the high cost of living in New York City may exacerbate the need for students to work part-time.

In fall 2010, the provost created a Task Force on Retention to study factors affecting retention and to make recommendations to improve it. The task force’s July 2011 report made several recommendations,31 including establishing a standing University-Wide Retention Committee, coupled with a Retention Office; the implementation of an early warning system to identify “at-risk” students in a timely way that would facilitate communication between different offices and academic divisions, so that proactive measures could be taken; and an improvement in existing retention efforts, including early warning notices, attendance tracking, and a review of first-year academic programs. While retention efforts focus generally on first-year students, the task force

29 One year cohort retention rates, four- and six-year cohort graduation rates, and comparisons with benchmark universities can be found in Appendix 4.XII.
30 A summary of findings and presentations can be found in Appendix 4.XIII.
31 The retention task force report is in Appendix 4.XIV.
also made recommendations specifically targeting students further along in their programs, including the implementation of DegreeWorks, and additional software and services to help students and faculty advisors monitoring student progress to degree completion, and to better monitor students on leave and those who drop out in their last year with minor amounts of credit to complete their degrees.

The university has already initiated a number of changes in response to the recommendations of the task force. For example, to ensure communication plans and workflows that impact retention are kept at the forefront of the university’s service decision-making processes, the university established the aforementioned University-Wide Retention Committee, which is responsible for vetting policy and procedures that impact retention. Additionally, the university has introduced two major software products—DegreeWorks and the Student Success Network (Starfish)—to assist students on their academic paths.

DegreeWorks was introduced to the university in spring 2012. It is an online degree audit program that allows students to see where they are in their degree program and what requirements are remaining. More on DegreeWorks follows in chapter 5 and chapter 6. Starfish is a web-based tool designed to help universities better monitor at-risk students through enhanced communication between students, their instructors and advisors, and student support services. For faculty and staff, the system allows for the easy tracking and flagging of students with academic, attendance, or other issues affecting academic progress. The program had a pilot year in fall 2012, with full-scale implementation following in fall 2013. As of fall 2013, all faculty and advising staff, as well as staff from SDS, Student Health Services, Student Rights and Responsibilities, and Student Support and Crisis Management will contribute to and access information (as appropriate) from Starfish.

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) also shed light on the degree to which students are satisfied with their academic programs. Since the last review in 2003, The New School participated in NSSE in 2006, 2010, and 2013. In spring 2010, NSSE was administered online to 1,423 first-year students and 1,114 seniors, yielding a 32 percent and 21 percent response rate, respectively (for an overall response rate of 27 percent). Results on the different benchmarks yielded mixed results. Predictably, there were areas where The New School students scored slightly better and slightly worse than other students in their Carnegie class, as well as having differences among divisions. For instance, first-year students and seniors scored significantly higher than their Carnegie peers in the Level of Academic Challenge (LAC) benchmark. However, they scored lower in frequency of tutoring, 

32 First-year students (reported) rated higher on the items: working harder than they thought they could to meet faculty members’ expectations; hours spent preparing for class; institutional emphasis on studying and hard work; number of medium-length papers written; coursework emphasis on analysis, synthesis, and evaluation of the value of information; and applying theory to practice. Seniors reported higher on the items: hours spent preparing for class; number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course reading; and coursework emphasis on analysis and synthesis.

33 This was based on frequency of participating in class, making class presentations, working with students during class and outside of class, and discussing ideas from readings or class with others outside of class.
teaching other students, and, somewhat surprisingly, in participating in community-based projects as part of a regular course. Seniors did not score differently from their peers on this benchmark, although they scored higher in two survey items and lower in three others. Finally, both first-year students and seniors scored lower on the Supportive Campus Environment (SEC) benchmark. The New School scores on this benchmark have declined slightly over the last four administrations of the survey.

Taken overall, these results are reflective of the changes The New School has undergone in the last decade. On the academic front, efforts made to increase full-time faculty (see chapter 3) and increased resources for curricular development and planning (see chapter 5) have perhaps contributed to gains in the LAC and ACL benchmarks, which suggests that students find their work challenging. The declines in the SEC benchmark are perhaps correlated with the growing pains The New School has experienced in keeping up with its increased enrollment. Chapter 6 contains additional information and assessment concerning retention efforts, the use of retention tools such as NSSE and ACT surveys, and the institution’s assessment of these efforts.

SECTION IV: STUDENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Policies are communicated to current students in multiple ways. They are discussed at orientation, by email, via educational campaigns (specifically for policy modifications), in the Student Handbook, on the Student Rights and Responsibilities Web page, and on the online portal (MyNewSchool). Policies are additionally communicated to all prospective and current studies via the university’s Your Right to Know Web page and official printed catalogs. Student Rights and Responsibilities Office provides guidance and information regarding the university’s structure, policies, and procedures. That office also adjudicates the Code of Conduct and other university policies (e.g., Sexual Harassment Policy detailed in chapter 1). The Office of Intercultural Support, Student Ombuds office informally assists students who wish to resolve conflicts, disputes, or complaints. This office offers independent, neutral, and, to the extent possible, confidential assistance.

There are academic and nonacademic grievance procedures in place for students. Each academic division has procedures for appealing grades and academic dismissals. The Registrar chairs an Appeals Committee that reviews tuition refund appeals, grade appeals that accompany leaves of absence, and late fee appeals. Procedures to appeal a finding of academic dishonesty can be found in the Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy, which is outlined in the official catalogs and on the university’s website. Nonacademic grievance procedures are based within the Student Rights and Responsibilities Office, where students can file grievances for alleged violations of the Code of Conduct and policies such as Sexual Harassment and Discrimination and Sexual Assault. In fall 2013, the university will launch a new webpage to serve as a central location for archiving past policies and displaying current policies.

---

34 The benchmark comprises quality of relationship with other students, quality of relationships with administrative personnel and offices, the institution’s provision of support for academic success, the institution’s provision of support for students to thrive socially, and the institution’s assistance with students coping with nonacademic responsibilities.

35 Further analysis of the NSSE results can be found in Appendix 4.IX.

36 For reasons of sustainability, the paper handbook has been recently replaced by a PDF.

37 This is through their office, official communications, and the Students Rights and Responsibility webpage.
The recent process of revising the university’s Sexual Assault Policy (which took effect at the start of the 2011–2012) serves as a good example of the ongoing efforts to increase transparency and support student self-governance. The Student Services Education Committee, an administrative group, joined with the Feminist Collective, a recognized student organization, to propose key revisions to the policy. The working group conducted research, identified best practices, and rewrote major sections of the policy. The Board of Trustees approved the newly revised Sexual Assault Policy, and although approval took place prior to the issuance of the Dear Colleague letter, the policy was in keeping with the suggested revisions stemming from the Office for Civil Rights.

Some of the changes that were enacted are an enhanced disciplinary review panel to hear cases, a revised appeal process to allow both the accused and accuser to appeal outcome determinations, and a more detailed set of definitions on sexual assault and consent. Following approval of the policy, an education campaign called “Yes Means Yes” was started. This campaign was led by an array of staff and students and included a series of educational posters. Students now receive a formal letter at the start of each school year informing them about the Sexual Assault Policy; and beginning with the fall 2013 orientation, the university will offer a workshop on consent.

SECTION V: RECOMMENDATIONS

- Conduct a comprehensive assessment of student support services, especially for international students, with a view toward greater effective integration of support systems to improve student success.
CHAPTER 5: PROGRAMS AND CURRICULUM

INTRODUCTION
This chapter examines how the university’s higher educational mission is realized through its educational offerings and how it connects its offerings with student learning goals and objectives in both undergraduate and graduate programs, and through continuing and professional education. The New School’s educational offerings have evolved as the university has gone through deep changes in its academic structure. In particular, this chapter lays out how the university seeks to support and advance the quality and rigor of its offerings through: the growth in the size of the full-time faculty (FTF, discussed in chapter 3); revision of existing programs; addition of new programs; and interdisciplinary learning, teaching, and scholarship that emphasize creativity, civic engagement, project-based learning, and distributed education.

SECTION I: ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND CURRICULUM

Chapter 1 discussed the ways in which The New School’s current mission builds upon the core academic values of existing programs and extends those values further through an emphasis on civic engagement and innovation. To different extents and in different ways, existing academic programs engage the university’s educational mission by their emphasis on academic rigor, innovative approaches to traditional subjects, civic engagement, and the cross-divisional availability of courses.¹

Procedures for Program Review

Programs that are accredited by professional educational agencies or boards have historically undergone regular cyclical reviews handled by deans of the relevant divisions. Beyond these programs, degree program evaluation was ad hoc and handled at the divisional level. In 2005, The Provost’s Office attempted to centralize and regularize these reviews, but because of the rapid turnover in leadership, the process remained dormant. In fall 2010, the Provost’s Office, in consultation with the deans, initiated a regularized program review process. In this process, all degree programs and supplemental curricular offerings are reviewed on a seven-year cycle.² This process is detailed in chapter 6. To date, five programs have completed all phases (except the final follow-up of a year later). Eight more programs have completed their self-study and external reviews, with additional programmatic self-studies in progress across the university.

Rethinking Existing Programs

Curricular revision in the divisions is an ongoing effort as the university seeks to ensure the quality and rigor of its offerings. In recent years, there have been some major curricular revisions; two are highlighted in this section.

A pivotal event in the evolution of Parsons The New School for Design (Parsons) took place in fall 2013, and which was the result of a thorough and carefully considered faculty-led review. In 2013,

¹ A list of existing degree programs is in Appendix 5.I.
² The Program Review Calendar is in Appendix 6.V.
the first year of a new four-year undergraduate curriculum was launched. The undergraduate curriculum will now expose design students to multiple fields and enable them to access a wider range of liberal arts courses across the university that can serve to fulfill curricular requirements. This revision is intended to fully integrate Parsons as a school and design as a field at the university.³

Mannes College The New School of Music (Mannes) recently completed a thorough self-examination resulting in wide-ranging proposals for curricular and programmatic changes consistent with the university’s mission. Among the curricular changes are significant revisions to the bachelor of music (BM) and master of music (MM) degree in all majors, plus new minors for the BM and two new dual-degree programs for graduate and undergraduate degrees.⁴ These changes are boldly and quickly changing the overall approach of the school from being a traditional conservatory model to a model aligned with the university’s vision of being at the cutting edge of creative practices.

Creation of New Programs

This last decade has seen a significant growth in new and revised programs. It has been especially important for The New School, as a progressive urban university, to incubate new programs, not only as a response to societal challenges and a changing workforce, but also as an important way to integrate the university’s divisions by focusing on its educational strengths and mission.

In this regard, faculty and deans are encouraged to develop new programs that align with aspects of the university’s mission that

- Promote pedagogical innovation and civic engagement
- Bolster student enrollment (ideally to successfully recruit from amongst diverse and new populations)
- Facilitate cross-divisional student flow through individual courses and minors
- Offer pathways between undergraduate and graduate programs across the university
- Support flexible, modular structures that allow for nimble modification as the need for the addition and/or removal of concentrations arise
- Articulate clear goals regarding career placement, supported by evidence of market research
- Emphasize project-based learning

In particular, the university’s stated commitments to pedagogical innovation, social justice, sustainability, and civic engagement have resulted in giving strong consideration to programs that extend and push beyond traditional disciplinary boundaries.

Review of Proposals for New Programs

Generally, the divisions are responsible for the development, internal delivery, and oversight of the content of individual programs, whereas the Provost’s Office is responsible for overseeing the

³ The details of the revision are in Appendix 5.II.
⁴ The details of the revisions are in Appendix 5.III.
quality of that delivery. The Provost’s Office has dedicated staff to manage the new program development process, and has charged the University Curriculum Committee (UCC), created in 2010, with reviewing new program proposals and substantive change requests for existing programs. The UCC is a university-wide group comprising a broad range of faculty and administrators that considers the consequences and effect on the curricula in their reviews and recommendations made to new program proposals and substantive change requests.

Centrally informed curricular priorities are supported at the divisional level by assistant and associate-level deans charged with overseeing and coordinating curricular affairs and initiatives. Since the substantive content of the university’s curricular offerings is primarily determined within its divisions, each division has its own review process and curricular templates that ensure appropriate degrees of flexibility and oversight. The curriculum is managed by faculty in departmental and curricular committees in consultation with the appropriate dean’s office in all divisions, although the structure and function of these committees varies. All divisions also have at least one representative on the UCC; these representatives are responsible for facilitating communications between the UCC and the divisional committees on all curricular matters.

The approval process for new programs is designed to ascertain the degree to which a proposed program aligns with the university’s academic priorities, is financially viable in terms of resources to support the program, is sustainable in terms of projected enrollment, and can meet other valuable goals. The Provost’s Office, the UCC, the divisional deans and directors, admissions directors, and the leaders of all administrative areas review all proposals and determine how a proposed program relates to these priorities.

There is an ongoing feedback loop that occurs during the development of a new academic program. The appropriate dean’s office submits an Initial Concept Proposal (ICP) that is reviewed by the UCC and senior staff in the Provost’s Office. Upon approval by the Provost’s Office, the faculty and dean’s office develop a detailed plan that requires narrative rationales and budget and resource documentation, as well as the articulation of program and course-level learning outcomes and curriculum maps.

External Review and Accreditation

If approved, the dean’s office works with the Provost’s Office to provide all information necessary to submit new programs for New York State Education Department (NYSED) approval and MSCHE, as in the case of new programs specifically designed for branch campus students. Some programs undergo regular accreditation reviews:

- Parsons has been accredited by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) since 1966.
- The master’s program in Architecture at Parsons has been accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) since 1994.

---

5 Divisional curricular development and review processes are in Appendix 5.IV.
6 Guidelines, processes, and templates for new program approval are in Appendix 5.V.
7 A list of new programs approved since the 2003 review is in Appendix 5.VI.
• The graduate Clinical Psychology program at The New School for Social Research (NSSR) has been accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA) since 1981.

• The master’s program in Urban Policy Analysis and Management at The New School for Public Engagement (NSPE) has been accredited by the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) since 1988.

Curricular Initiatives

Cross-Divisional Initiatives

The New School historically has been composed of discrete programs housed in separate academic divisions, with the exception of the bachelor of arts/bachelor of fine arts (BAFA) programs shared between Eugene Lang College The New School for Liberal Arts (Lang), Parsons, and The New School for Jazz and Contemporary Jazz (Jazz). In the last ten years, the university has moved rapidly to embrace a new vision in which students are encouraged to take advantage of the diversity of academic programming across the institution. In reality, however, this was often not feasible because of the lack of policy coordination across divisions.

Implementation of this vision has recently been supported by specific initiatives designed to facilitate cross-divisional registration. First, whereas prior to 2012 students in each division had different start and end times for their courses, a common bell schedule implemented in fall 2012 established start and end times for course scheduling that removed many of the obstacles to enrolling in courses in other divisions.8 Second, an online degree audit system has been implemented that gives students and academic advisors a simpler and more direct way of determining how a student is progressing toward their degree completion. It is organized to let students see which requirements must still be completed and to give them an opportunity to view optional scenarios, such as changing majors or adding a minor.9 Third, a new online university-wide course catalog allows both an external audience, as well as the university community, to view the full scope of available courses.10 A university-wide task force is underway to review the user interfaces and experiences of these new online self-help programs.

Several other new initiatives support the goals of cross–fertilization, interdisciplinary teaching, and learning and pedagogical innovation. These include

• Innovations in Education Fund Grant (IEF), which provides support for New School faculty doing innovative work with curriculum and pedagogy

• Fund for Collaborative Innovation, which provides financial support to partnership projects that will bring together The New School’s faculty and students with external organizations to address the urban challenges of New York City.

• Curriculum and Learning, housed in the Provost’s Office, which sponsors events and activities that focus on new opportunities and pathways that broaden academic experiences by incorporating innovative and best practices in teaching and learning.
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8 A depiction of the bell schedule can be found in Appendix 5.VII.
9 Screen image captures and a tutorial for online asset are available in Appendix 5.VIII.
10 Though the course catalog is online, physical catalogs are still printed yearly. Copies are in Appendix 5.IX.
The Green Fund, begun in 2010, which awards up to $50,000 each year to fund research projects by students and faculty that have a sustainability focus.

The bachelor degree programs in Global Studies, Environmental Studies, and Urban Design are examples that highlight innovative undergraduate education developments that involve interdivisional collaboration. Developed by interdisciplinary and interdivisional groups of faculty, these programs incorporated many existing courses across the university, in addition to developing new courses. Initially designed without divisional ownership and lacking clear governance, some of these programs became housed in NSPE. The Urban Design and Environmental Studies programs have lost some of their original vitality, in terms of attracting students to enroll, partly due to the lack of clarity regarding governance, while Global Studies (developed to be governed by one school at NSPE) has continued to thrive.

One example of cross-divisional thinking within the complex organization of Parsons is the masters of fine arts program in Transdisciplinary Design, which was launched in fall 2010. The curricular development and orientation of this program demonstrate the university’s overarching commitments to creativity, innovation, and social engagement. The interdisciplinary teaching, peer-learning, and collaborative projects similarly build on a long history of project-based learning. Although still in its infancy, the program’s early success—from the application and enrollment numbers to recognition accorded to the graduates’ thesis projects in the profession—speaks to the ways in which the program’s agenda resonates with both students and within the industry.

Other examples of cross-divisional thinking are culled from the masters and doctoral programs at NSSR and at the Milano School of International Affairs, Management, and Urban Policy (Milano). These programs have long been examples of the strength that comes from interdisciplinary approaches in social research and applied professional studies. Over the past decade, concerted efforts by multiple stakeholders have created curricular and intellectual bridges across programs and divisions. For example, ethnography is a key intersection between design and social research that the university is exploring in terms of curricular development. Faculty from NSSR and Parsons have begun collaborating on new approaches to teaching and research in social science and design. A number of faculty hires, coordinated across departments and divisions, have helped build a strong cohort of young faculty and graduate students in Anthropology, Politics, and Sociology at NSSR, in Transdisciplinary Design at Parsons, and in Organizational Change at Milano, which all share interests in bridging design, social science, and policy fields.

### University Lecture Courses

In 2002, the University Lecture Course (ULEC) program became the first university-wide requirement for all undergraduates enrolling at Parsons, Lang, and Jazz as first-year students. Mannes and The New School for Drama (Drama) undergraduates will participate beginning in 2014. ULEC courses generally fall into two categories: introduction to disciplines (e.g.,
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11 A comparative look at enrollment data is available in Appendix 2.I.
12 Course syllabi that resulted from these collaborations can be found in Appendix 5.X.
Introduction to Psychology, Aesthetics) and multidisciplinary approaches to themes (e.g., Evil in the 20th Century, Re-imagining New York). These courses serve several purposes, namely

- To bring together students from the undergraduate divisions to offer the benefit of access to wide ranging viewpoints and experiences
- To give undergraduates a chance to benefit from the teaching of some of the university’s most interesting and prominent scholars
- To create a place for broad and innovative interdisciplinary thinking
- To offer an experience of a class with lecture format, a valuable pedagogical mode that is infrequently encountered in several of the divisions

**Project-Based Learning in the Curriculum**

The new academic mission and vision statement highlights civic engagement and experiential and project-based learning; in doing so, it builds upon and deepens longstanding commitments across the university. Experiential, practice-based, problem-based, and civically engaged learning have long been hallmarks of The New School. The array of activities that might be classed under this is vast, so this chapter focuses on a few that demonstrate the wealth and breadth of educational work in this area.

Parsons has historically identified with experiential learning with its strong studio-based curricula that requires students to apply their knowledge in hands-on settings. One example is the innovative Parsons DESIS lab, which pioneered a number of social innovation efforts; the lab was funded by grants from the Rockefeller Foundation. Experiential learning has also been an integral part of learning in the performing arts divisions of Drama, Jazz, and Mannes, and it is the hallmark of NSPE’s programs in Media Studies, Urban Policy, Management, and Organizational Change. Students in NSPE’s graduate program in International Affairs have the opportunity to participate in an international field program under faculty supervision with nongovernment organizations, international organizations, and government and local agencies in approximately a dozen countries. Students can then apply their theoretical knowledge to explore specific issues and problems onsite. In order to insure that project-based coursework is systematically offered to all undergraduates (a goal set within the 2013 strategic plan), the university is expanding its ULEC program (described in detail below) to encompass a fuller range of pedagogical contexts, including project-based learning.

The university has cultivated many relationships with community partners that provide experiences for students that are relevant to and enrich their academic development.

**Civic Engagement and Social Justice**

Civic engagement and social justice are core values infused throughout much of the curricula, from undergraduate to graduate education. Many of The New School’s educational offerings are
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13 A selection of course syllabi is in Appendix 5.XI.
14 The guidelines and materials for these experiences can be found in Appendix 5.XII.
15 Examples can be seen in the university’s wide array of public programs, intellectual centers, classes made possible through the Fund for Collaborative Innovation, multiple exchange and articulation agreements, and professional internships.
aimed at addressing social issues that engage students with the community, city, and world. Much of this work is supported by the newly formed Social Justice Office, through the university’s membership in the Ashoka Foundation and through grants from the Rockefeller Foundation.

Community engagement is embedded in many undergraduate majors at Lang and Parsons, as well as in courses across the university. It is most prominent in undergraduate programs, including integrated design, urban studies, and education studies. The sustainability area of study in Parson’s Integrated Design Program challenges students to design products and services that promote more sustainable ways of living. At Lang, the Arts degree program provides opportunities for students to serve the community through theater and dance. Lang and Parsons degree programs require capstone courses, and students are encouraged, whether in teams or as individuals, to incorporate community engagement into their projects. For example, product design majors choose a nonprofit organization with which to partner in the development of their senior project. At the graduate level, students in NSPE’s policy, management, and international affairs programs are expected to work on projects with community partners as part of their professional training. NSSR’s Clinical Psychology doctoral students are engaged in volunteer clinical activities that serve the New York City–metro area. Many of NSPE’s media studies and Parson’s design and technology students intern and collaborate with nonprofit agencies as diverse as the Red Cross and local public high schools.

As a means of documenting progress toward the university’s civic engagement goals, the Provost's Office, since 2009, has annually maintained a list of civic engagement offerings across the university. Included on this list are internships, research projects, mentoring, or other activities that are done in partnership with community organizations or groups. In 2011, the university joined two national associations, Campus Compact and Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life, which provide opportunities for students to link civic engagement and social justice work to their scholarship and academic training.

**Dual-Degree Programs**

In an effort to cultivate new student markets and to provide attractive opportunities for academically talented students to take full advantage of the wide range of degree offerings across the various divisions, The New School nurtures existing dual-degree programs and the development of new ones. These involve a combination of bachelors and masters programs, and entail a shorter residency if the two degrees are pursued sequentially. Upper-division undergraduates can apply to be admitted to bachelor–master’s status. They may, with advising, take entry-level graduate courses that apply to their bachelor’s degree and, after graduation, to their master’s degree, thus shortening their residency. Some dual-degree programs are within the same division, while others are across divisions. New procedures were put in place in fall 2012 to clarify internal processes and to reduce the number of administrative hurdles that students need to jump over in order to complete both degrees.
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16 A list of these courses appears in Appendix 5.XIII.
17 A list of current dual-degree programs are in Appendix 5.XIV. Advisory guidelines for BAMA and BAFA students are available online.
Distributed and Online Learning

In an effort to make classes available to a hitherto underserved population of students for whom enrollment in onsite courses was not possible, The New School began offering distance education classes in 1985; by 1995, it offered an MA in Media Studies and a BA completion program entirely online.18 Between 2006 and 2011, enrollment growth in online classes outpaced on-campus classes.19 Its growth has been driven by instructor preference, new funding sources (for example, online course development at NSPE was supported by a $275,000 grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation), and the recognition that some programs are more suitable for being entirely online.20

Online programs and classes at The New School are currently proposed, organized, and supervised by the academic departments in which they are housed, following the same procedures as on-campus classes with regard to curriculum review, faculty supervision, student course ratings, and so on.

All for-credit online classes meet the same standards as on-campus classes. All of The New School’s online programs are registered with NYSED.

New School Distributed Education

The New School Distributed Education (NSDE) provides support for faculty and students in online courses, as well as in face-to-face or blended classes that use Web-based and online technology. The Office of the Provost currently oversees the NSDE, after several years of it reporting to the Office of Information Technology. New online instructors are required to complete a six-week online class that covers online technology and pedagogy. There are also easily accessible tutorials, both video and written, and in-class support, as needed. Faculty support can range from reviewing the syllabus and helping the instructor consider the design and student experience to instruction on the use of the Learning Management System (LMS) and other online technology. The New School has been using Blackboard LMS since 2006, but in May 2013, the university decided to adopt Canvas to replace Blackboard. During the transition in fall 2013, both Blackboard and Canvas will be available, with a full move to Canvas in January 2014. Details regarding the migration to Canvas are discussed in chapter 2.

Global Education

With the hiring a vice president for Distributed and Global Education in 2011, The New School embarked on an initiative to establish a global network of urban-based education centers. The goals of this initiative are to create educational opportunities for students and faculty that are unique to specific cities. This will be accomplished through rich exchanges, both physical and virtual, between students and faculty in each location. The intent is to not simply export the curriculum of New York programs, but to “localize” curricula through the use of resident faculty
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18 See the 2009 Online Learning at the New School report in Appendix 5.XV.
19 Data from The New School Fact Book (Table 2.21 from 2006 and Table 2.16 2012).
20 The Sloan E-Learning Initiative at The New School Final Report is in Appendix 5.XVI; a list of the current online program offerings at The New School appears online.
and student engagement in the local, civic, cultural, and business communities. The two locations
selected thus far are Paris, France, and Mumbai, India, with discussions underway for a site in at
least one major city in China. Activities in Paris and Mumbai began in summer 2013.

The university has sought to gradually increase its range of international study-abroad
opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students, in a manner consistent with its mission of
expanding students’ global awareness and perspectives. Lang sends 100 to 150 undergraduate
students abroad each year, primarily through facilitating study abroad via external accredited
programs or by applying directly to preapproved, accredited foreign or domestic universities. Lang
has a limited number of exchanges available for its students in Amsterdam and Paris. Additionally,
Lang faculty leads short study abroad trips during semester breaks. Parsons has a list of exchange
partners, including Konstfack in Stockholm and Bezalel Academy of Art and Design in
Jerusalem. Parsons Paris, and other projected international Parsons campuses, suggests
opportunities for flexibility in studying abroad across other university divisions. More than 40
Parsons students have applied for study abroad at Parsons Paris, and Lang will send a cohort of 20
students to Parsons Paris in spring 2014. The Graduate Program in International Affairs’ summer
International Field Program, described later in this chapter, is also a significant study abroad
offering. The Transregional Center for Democratic Studies, housed at NSSR, offers intensive
courses in Poland and South Africa during summer and winter breaks. The New School students,
mainly from NSSR and Lang, alongside students from Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and
sub-Saharan Africa, take course-for-credit taught by The New School and other faculty.

Emerging Initiatives

Learning Portfolios

The adoption of e-Portfolios is recent at the university, and is intended to serve multiple purposes.
It will allows students to take ownership of their education by reflecting on their learning over time
through consideration of “artifacts” they include in their e-Portfolio. These artifacts can include
drafts and final products, and learning experiences within and outside the classroom. It will be
used for collaborative learning; as an important tool for students, faculty, and advisors to better
integrate what the university expects to be increasingly diverse and individualized learning; for
students to develop professional presentations of their studies and accomplishments for potential
employers; and for the university to assess student learning. Parsons and Drama BFA programs
have incorporated e-Portfolios use into their first-year curricula for fall 2013. A university
committee is charged with coordinating the adoption of e-Portfolios across the institution.22

New Approaches to Doctoral Education

The emergent research culture, driven by the work produced in cross-disciplinary programs, has
informed a university-wide project to develop a praxis-based doctorate program, which will
further support research in these fields. The praxis doctorate will build on the traditional PhD
model, characterized by rigorous empirical and/or textual research that culminates in a written
dissertation, but it departs from how it defines research. Instead, various forms of practice can
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21 A full list of institutions The New School has articulation or exchange agreements with is in Appendix 5.XVII.
22 An update on the timeline of the is project and the membership of this committee is in Appendix 5.XVIII.
generate new knowledge and understanding of the world and, therefore, can constitute fully legitimate pathways of scholarship. This developing program is distinguished by its orientation toward praxis (the integration of theory and practice in the active creation of new artifacts, processes, and understandings) and its embrace of a wide variety of research methods, creative approaches, and means of dissemination. As currently imagined, the praxis PhD is intended for advanced students in some of the design fields at Parsons, and as well as from NSPE’s Media Studies program.23

SECTION II: COMMUNICATION OF DEGREE OFFERINGS, REVISIONS, AND ACADEMIC PRIORITIES

Print and Electronic Materials

Whenever new programs or changes to existing programs occur, the Provost’s Office notifies all administrative offices of the change. The Provost’s Office works closely with Communications and External Affairs to ensure that all developed materials correctly portray institutional offerings. When materials are created, whether for print or digital dissemination, a final copy is reviewed for accuracy and to affirm the piece is correctly informing current or potential students on programs and that the programs meets all required standards by accrediting and legal bodies. The university annually creates new program catalogs that are published on the web.

Academic Advisement

Academic advising structures employ various means to communicate changes to curricula and the overall set of offerings to students. Parsons prefers communicating this information in person via group advising meetings, which are then reinforced during one-on-one advising sessions held before every registration period. NSPE sends weekly email communications with curricula updates to students, and follows up with one-on-one advising sessions. At Lang, approaches vary according to department. Regardless of how students are initially informed, all programs also have their curricula changes coded into DegreeWorks, the self-service online degree audit program, so that all students and their advisors can see how curricula offerings and revisions may impact a student’s path to degree completion.

With the opening up of learning opportunities across the university, a more integrated and coherent approach to advising will be essential. As such, the newly formed Student Success Office is intended to develop this coordinated approach to advising across the institution.

Distinctions between Levels

The university’s course numbering system makes clear distinctions between precollege and college, and between undergraduate and graduate levels of study. Precollege courses are “0” level in the catalogs. These are outreach programs for high school students; some programs enable the granting of undergraduate credit. Undergraduate course are generally labeled from 1000 to 4999. However, there are times when the university wishes to explicitly bridge undergraduate and graduate levels. When a course is cross-registered for undergraduates and graduates, the learning

23 A report presented to the Provost is available in Appendix 5.XIX.
objects for both levels are communicated clearly, and are appropriate to the level. These courses are clearly distinguished in university catalogs with accurate information on learning levels.

SECTION III: GENERAL EDUCATION

Historical Background

Until the 1970s, The New School’s liberal arts undergraduate programs were designed for mature students completing undergraduate education that had begun elsewhere. Consequently, the need for a general education curriculum did not become particularly obvious or acute until the advent of the undergraduate programs at Parsons, Mannes, Lang, and Jazz, which were designed for more traditional-aged students. For much of their existence, these divisions attempted to deal with the issue of general education by crafting their own curricula; the logic being that it would be easier to match the curriculum with the unique needs and ecologies of their respective programs and student bodies. Only recently has there been a concerted effort to forge a university-wide general education curriculum, which, as explained below, is part of a larger and more ambitious initiative called Shared Capacities.

Divisional Practices

Currently, and increasingly, each division adapts its curriculum to the university’s general education goals. Of the five divisions offering undergraduate degrees (Parsons, Lang, NSPE, Mannes, and Jazz), all highlight first-year requirements or offerings that focus on basic communication skills in writing and speaking, and then develop general proficiencies common across all the majors in their degree programs. Many have taken or are taking steps to guarantee that technological literacy is up-to-date and that quantitative reasoning is implicit within program-specific areas or activities. Requirements in several of the divisions have either gone through or are going through major revision since the last 2003 self-study. Two goals of the revisions are to strengthen general education proficiencies in several areas and to better connect curricular content to the university’s mission.

At the present time, each division has clearly articulated approaches to ensure written, oral—and increasingly visual—communication skills. The approaches to scientific and quantitative competencies vary considerably by program.

University-Wide Initiatives

Since the last self-study, The New School has moved toward university-wide articulation and delivery of some components of general education. The university’s official definition of general education was approved by all divisional deans and now appears on the website and catalogs of all divisions.

*General Education at the University: The New School’s academic programs are designed to prepare students to be productive citizens in the 21st century. In addition to mastery of discipline-specific competencies, the university expects all of its graduates to be able to demonstrate the capacity to think critically; to analyze quantitative and/or scientific*
constructs; to communicate effectively both orally and in writing; and [to] use appropriate technologies as tools for collecting information.

The concern for general education at the university level has been furthered by various initiatives in recent years. These include work undertaken by the Assessment of Student Learning Committee and their participation in a summer institute and the creation the UCC Subcommittee on Shared Capacities. The subcommittee is focusing on finding capacities shared by students in all divisions. Both committees are discussed briefly below.

Fall 2010 marked the formation of the Assessment of Student Learning Committee (also discussed in Chapter 6). Part of its work in the first and second years was to encourage the articulation of learning outcomes for general education proficiencies at the divisional level, while conversations were beginning elsewhere about a broader approach.24

A more concerted effort began in summer 2012, when a group of faculty and administrators participated in the annual Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Summer Institute on General Education and Assessment. The goals of the institute were to prepare an action plan for developing university-wide shared undergraduate capacities, and to educate institutional teams about current research and best practices to help them implement action plans at their home institutions. An action plan developed by the participants, and revised by various New School’s deans’ offices and the Provost’s Office senior staff, is now being implemented. It calls for faculty-centered conversations over the current academic year that will result in clarification of shared undergraduate capacities that align with the university’s mission. The general education proficiencies as articulated by MSCHE are part of the larger discussion of shared capacities.

To this end, spring 2013 saw the creation of a UCC Subcommittee on Shared Capacities, with representation from all divisions and leadership from the Provost’s Office. The charge of the subcommittee is to lead a university-wide conversation, primarily among faculty but including students, alumni, and staff, about the capacities and proficiencies expected of all undergraduate students. Next steps will include divisional mapping of coursework, cocurricular opportunities for shared undergraduate capacities, and the realignment of curricula to ensure that all shared capacities are taught and reinforced throughout the university. The existing ULEC curriculum will also be overhauled and contextualized within the larger framework of the Shared Capacities Initiative and the 2013 strategic plan.25 The Shared Capacities committee shares the progress and process of its work via its website where the community can also provide feedback on the work of the committee.

SECTION IV: UNIVERSITY RESOURCES AND CURRICULA

Academic Support Facilities and Resources

The University Learning Center (ULC), formally known as the University Writing Center, provides The New School students with a variety of support and services in the continuing development of their academic skills. The primary service is writing assistance; however, the ULC
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24 See chapter 6 for more information on the assessment of general education.
25 Mapping of the ULEC offerings to specific skills for the last three years can be found in Appendix 5.XX.
also provides math support, ESL services, graduate-level tutoring, time management, and oral presentation workshops. Students are served through one-on-one sessions with trained and experienced tutors, either in person or via Skype. The ULC also holds biweekly workshops, such as “Structuring an Argument,” “Critical Thinking,” “Time Management,” and “Writing with Authority.” Furthermore, faculty can schedule in-class workshops on a wide range of writing topics, all of which include a general orientation to the ULC. The ULC also has two satellite locations—one at Parsons and one at Mannes—to serve students at other campus locations and provides additional resources via its website.

The university purposely uses its art collection to enrich curricula when possible. The curators collaborate across the university with numerous instructors, using works from the art collection to support and help devise creative strategies to enhance coursework. They also collaborate with faculty and students to mount exhibitions in the Anna-Maria and Stephen Kellen Gallery, housed at the Sheila C. Johnson Design Center, and to conduct frequent curated tours of the art collection with both internal and external groups.26

The New School Libraries & Archives (TNSLA) are an important resource for both students and faculty across the university. In addition to providing access to a traditional library collection (i.e., books), both on campus and through university consortium arrangements, the TNSLA provides access to an ever-increasing catalog of electronic titles; in fact, as of fall 2013, nearly 80 percent of the Libraries & Archives titles are in digital format. The TNSLA provides an array of services to The New School community, and subject specialist librarians provide traditional, in-person reference, and virtual reference through its “Ask-Us” service.

Librarians have also increased their role as liaisons to the faculty, creating in-class opportunities for instruction in information literacy-related topics. Librarians and archivists prepare targeted or assignment-based library instruction to meet specific research or information needs. Events and workshops are offered throughout the year, which are designed to improve research skills and the use of online tools. Subject-specific and class-related research guides compiled by the librarians and archivists are available online to assist with research and to promote relevant resources accessible through The New School Libraries & Archives.

Other services, such as improved copying and scanning resources, self-checkout, integration with the Student Success Network for scheduling, and branch-delivery service have improved the user experience with Libraries & Archives. Along with the new spaces and organizational structure discussed in chapter 2, these services make TNSLA an integral part of the academic support resources at the university.27

Faculty Resources

Chapter 3 described changes in faculty composition over the last ten years, including a dramatic increase in full-time faculty (FTF) and the unionization of part-time faculty (PTF) with its concomitant Collective Bargaining Agreements. With the increase in the number of FTF and proportional-share faculty in the university, and with the corresponding increase in the number of

26 A list of the holdings of the collection and recent exhibitions is online.
27 Additional detail regarding the university libraries and associated resources are in chapter 2.
courses being taught by FTF, the university is ensuring long-term supervisory, advisory, and service duties in support of its curriculum.

SECTION V: CONNECTING THE CURRICULUM TO SPECIFIC AUDIENCES

Orientation activities have changed considerably over the last several years. Prior to 2010, student orientation week had been largely focused on nonacademic events. In response to student and faculty feedback, deans requested a program that would provide both an introduction to the college-level learning environment and an academic component linking to students’ work during the academic year.

Student orientation is a week-long series of events intended to help freshmen and new transfer students succeed. It includes academic advising (both group and one-on-one) and an introduction to support services (such as Student Health Services, Disability Services, and the libraries). A required academic activity, *Experience + Meaning*, was implemented in fall 2011. *Experience + Meaning* is designed to assist new first-year students in connecting their subsequent academic studies and to help in developing a sense of community. The activity pairs small groups of students with instructors, where the students are introduced to basic college learning practices, such as active listening, argumentation, and oral reflection. Then students visit one of the three local city parks located near the Greenwich Village campus to develop their critical thinking and observation skills. The experience is then carried forward to one or more of their academic classes, where the orientation experience is expanded upon and related to class material.

As part of their orientation activities, students in online courses complete a basic tutorial in the use of technology (Blackboard/Canvas Learning Management Systems, discussed above) and best practices in online education.

**Underprepared Students**

Additional resources for underprepared students are discussed in chapter 4. Academically, The New School has taken an approach to the development of basic skills that is different from the approach in many other universities, given the unique composition of the university’s undergraduate population, with a majority of students in design and the performing arts, and with a large proportion of international students. Basic skills for these populations are defined differently and are addressed in diverse ways within the divisions, to supplement broader initiatives for all students at the university level. These diagnostic and remedial activities take place at the graduate level as well.

The large international population in some of The New School’s divisions—particularly at Parsons and Mannes—brings with it the need to sharpen the university’s focus on instruction in English as a Second Language. At Parsons, the delivery of this curriculum has recently been shifted from its School of Art and Design History and Theory to NSPE’s English Language Studies program, where faculty have extensive expertise in English-language teaching through the master’s program in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages. For students whose language skills and TOEFL scores do not qualify a student for admission, Parsons has instituted a certificate program entitled *ESL+Design* (ESL+D), in which intensive English courses delivered
by NSPE are combined with introductory instruction in design. Mannes has continued to offer ESL instruction at its own location, with supervisory assistance provided by staff at NSPE, and it has recently introduced a program entitled ESL+Music (ESL+M), which is modeled on the Parsons ESL+D. The Mannes program was launched in fall 2013.

Some of the university’s divisions have identified a need for specialized remediation for students apart from English instruction. At Parsons, students getting ready to enter the masters of fine arts program in Design & Technology can brush up on their skills in Web development and interactive design in a three-week intensive “boot camp,” so that they are prepared to focus on the more conceptual and pragmatic concerns of design processes once the fall semester begins. Mannes students who are considered underprepared are enrolled in intensive courses during their first year, so as that by the beginning of their second year, they are at the level of the more qualified entering students.

The New School participates in the Arthur O. Eve Higher Education Opportunity Program (HEOP), which provides academic support and financial assistance to young people who might not meet all the traditional college admissions criteria, but whom in other ways show promise of succeeding in college. Information on HEOP can be found in chapter 4 and online.

Transfer Students and Credit for Prior Learning

Transfer students are an increasingly important component of The New School’s student body. Furthermore, The New School students are increasingly seeking to study abroad and transfer credit back to The New School. Transfer credits are currently being evaluated by the university, and it is in the process of developing institution-wide policies for deciding which transfer credits to accept.

The New School also has a rigorous plan for students who wish to receive credit for prior learning, as explained on NSPE’s website. Since 2005, 220 students have prepared dossiers for credit for prior learning, earning a sum total of 1,645 credits.

Expedited Degree Completion for Dual-Degree Programs

Upper-level undergraduates admitted to NYSED-approved dual-degree (BA/MA) programs have the opportunity to expedite degree completion, as described above.
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28 The ESL+D program, begun in 2010, replaced a program formally known as Summer Orientation Program for International Students (SOPIS), which was an intensive English-language program for conditionally accepted Parsons students. Held in the summer, SOPIS students followed a rigorous academic schedule for eight weeks in the aim of getting their English to an acceptable level to manage college-level classes. Students had to pass all of their classes, as well as a final exam, in order to enter Parsons in the fall. SOPIS helped prepare students for the academic and language challenges, in addition to the new cultural challenges, of living in New York City. ESL+D built on the SOPIS experience, expanding the depth and scope by offering a full-year, one summer, or one semester program, and the option of taking a design course for credit at Parsons, transferable if the student were to be admitted.

29 Transfer credit policies can be found in Appendix 5.XXI.

30 The steps for this evaluation are described at length on the NSPE website.
Branch Campuses

The university opened its first branch campus with the relaunch of Parsons Paris in summer 2013 (having existed in a number of forms since the 1920s). Parsons Paris, which has received provisional approval from MSCHE as a branch campus, is a separate legal entity, established in France, though controlled and governed entirely by The New School. Students at Parsons Paris will, in fact, be students of The New School and receive their degrees from The New School. The campus is led by an academic dean and administrative director, who each report to the Provost’s Office. Curricula will emanate from the university and increasingly from Parsons Paris, with local faculty being hired and reviewed by university committees.

Contractual Relations and Affiliates

As previously mentioned in the section on Distributed and Global Education, the university maintains numerous contractual relations to enhance its curricular experience. The university’s growing network of local and international relationships is an integral part of delivering on its mission to prepare students to be global citizens. In addition to the variety of international and distant affiliates, The New School also has articulation agreements with many local institutions, including the American Music and Dance Academy, The New York Film Academy, and the Culinary Arts Institute.31

The Doctoral Consortium

The Doctoral Consortium is available to The New School doctoral students, and offers students the opportunity to take courses at participating institutions; the consortium includes Columbia University, CUNY Graduate Center, Fordham University, New York University, Princeton University, Rutgers University, and Stony Brook University. Students are restricted to courses not offered at their home universities and must receive approval from their home institutions. Consortium school administrators meet annually to review policies and procedures and to prevent potential problems. Along with furthering the training of research-oriented students in a traditional fashion, the Doctoral Consortium affords The New School students contact with multiple faculty, reaching beyond the university’s borders and cultivating a broader community.

SECTION VI: RELATED NONDEGREE LEARNING

Nondegree and Noncredit Study

Part of the university’s institutional mission from its inception has been to provide educational opportunities for adult learners and career changers. To this end, it provides options for populations who seek a credential without needing a full degree program through open enrollment in three divisions: Parsons, NSPE, and Mannes. General credit and noncredit courses are available for youth through precollege and for adults through both continuing education and certificate offerings. These offerings were natural outgrowths of existing curricular strengths and were

31 A full list can be found in Appendix 5.XVII.
largely created from curricula that are part of existing degree programs. The university also offers a wide variety and extensive schedule of public programming.\textsuperscript{32}

**Precollege Programs**

Mannes and Parsons offer programs for precollege students. Mannes preparatory programs are for children (starting at four years of age) and for youth. There are programs to support a range of students, from beginners to the most proficient, including an Honors Program for the most advanced students. There are also several types of precollege programs at Parsons, including year-round and summer courses. The most ambitious experiences include a summer undergraduate level experience for older high school students and visiting undergraduates. Additionally, Parsons offers the Parsons Summers Program, a three-year college preparation scholarship program for New York City public high school students.\textsuperscript{33}

**For-Credit and Noncredit Certificates**

NSPE offers one for-credit certificate program at the undergraduate level, both on campus and online, and it offers five other certificate programs at the graduate level, one of which is also available online. NSPE also offers five noncredit certificate programs. Parsons has five noncredit certificate offerings, two of which are available online, and one for-credit certificate at the graduate level. Mannes offers diplomas at the undergraduate and graduate levels, which provide routes to advanced performance studies outside of the normal degree tracks. Beginning in fall 2013, Mannes will also offer a noncredit certificate in ESL+Music, modeled on Parsons’ ESL+Design certificate.

**Mixing Credit and Noncredit Student Populations**

The university has traditionally offered both targeted noncredit courses and programs (e.g., Mannes extension program), along with courses that mix credit and noncredit populations. Because of how course evaluations are conducted, it is difficult to know whether there is an impact on student satisfaction as a result of mixing both types of students. Credit students pay substantially more in tuition than noncredit students, who are typically not held to the same academic and classroom expectations as credit students. This could impact the experience for for-credit students.

**SECTION VII: RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Systematically integrate the five general education proficiencies into the Shared Capacities Initiative with focus on improving quantitative/scientific reasoning.

\textsuperscript{32} A full event calendar is available online. Programming predating the online calendar is available upon request.\textsuperscript{33} A list of current precollege programming is available online.
CHAPTER 6: ASSESSMENT

INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides an overview of the history and evolving structure of the university’s approach to the assessment of institutional effectiveness and student learning outcomes. Also detailed are the ongoing and planned improvements in institutional assessments that will occur over the next five years.

A comprehensive, systematic assessment of institutional effectiveness at The New School is a relatively new enterprise that is still a work in progress. However, the university has made significant strides over the last three years in building a durable and sustainable institutional assessment infrastructure. Moreover, with the formal adoption of the university’s newly articulated strategic plan, coupled with a revitalized and better resourced Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE), the university is now positioned to ensure that the assessment of institutional effectiveness at all levels, including student learning, can reliably guide future institutional planning and decision making.

SECTION I: HISTORY AND EVOLUTION OF THE ASSESSMENT CULTURE AT THE NEW SCHOOL

Systematic assessment of the effectiveness with which The New School is pursuing its institutional mission is a relatively recent development. During the end of the Kerrey presidency, the administration started making purposeful strides to move the university to a unified model of operation. However, prior to the recent presidential change, institutional assessment was not particularly coordinated, systematized, or even purposeful. Student learning was assessed informally by faculty members, and programs ensured that their students were mastering program learning through capstone experiences, final projects, and other terminal experiences that provided students with a chance to demonstrate learning at the end of their programs to faculty members. Many programs had strong methods for understanding and tracking student learning at the individual level. For example, the auditioning and jury systems at The New School for Jazz and Contemporary Music (Jazz) and Mannes College The New School for Music (Mannes) provided regular and rigorous assessment of student skills. At The New School for Social Research (NSSR), members of the dean’s staff reviewed the progress of every NSSR student every semester to judge whether they were meeting certain benchmarks to keep them on track toward their degree, and each student received a cover letter outlining their progress. This is reviewed in greater detail below.

Many factors contributed to this state of affairs, but perhaps one of the most important was that the Office of Institutional Research had been underfunded and understaffed for much of the last decade. With the bulk of its resources devoted to compliance and external reporting, and responding to ad hoc requests for information from across the university, the residual capacity for an ongoing, systematic analysis of data in support of the university’s strategic planning activities was often insufficient. As the effort to move a single university intensified under the new administration, the office dramatically changed its organizational structure and refined its mandate, as detailed in section II of this chapter.
Forging an integrated university, both structurally and with regards to strategic planning, is integral to effective institutional assessment. As outlined in the preceding chapters, there has been no shortage of domain-specific planning activity across the university, with much of it guided by data derived from ongoing division- or office-specific assessment activity. Historically, decisions were made at the divisional level, but starting in 2006, this has been moving toward the university level. For example, robust planning and data-guided decision-making processes began to happen centrally in the specific areas of financial and budgetary planning (see chapter 2); facilities and space planning (chapter 2); the development of new degree and certificate programs (see chapter 5); degree program review; and in faculty promotion and hiring (see chapter 3). Additionally, as outlined in chapter 4, Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) is responsible for planning and executing strategies that ensure that the university’s student admissions profiles conform to the university’s mission and goals. This, of course, is not possible without access to timely and accurate data about the types of students who are likely to be most successful in specific programs, as well other kinds of information that the office would need to make informed decisions throughout the application/admission process.

Additionally, formal, university-led assessments of student learning at The New School began at the program-level, when the Assessment of Student Learning Committee\(^1\) requested that all degree-granting programs articulate student-learning outcomes in fall 2010, and that at least one program be assessed in spring 2011. It was determined that the initial focus would be on programmatic learning outcomes, rather than general undergraduate capacities, due to the wide range of specialized programs. By starting with program-level outcomes, the Assessment Committee hoped faculty from across the university would engage more effectively and become accustomed to doing systematized assessments of learning outcomes in a familiar capacity and space. However, coordinating and implementing these assessment results has been difficult because of the cultural shift needed to move to a more assessment-oriented approach.

This chapter first describes the administrative changes and resource investments that have been made in an effort to craft a better integrated and robust institutional assessment infrastructure, and then it describes the activities that are enhancing the level of involvement and collaboration between faculty and staff in promoting a culture of assessing institutional and curricular outcomes. Section IV focuses on the assessment and data utilization processes that these enhancements have enabled, particularly with regard to student-learning outcomes. The same section illustrates how data from various levels of assessment, from course evaluations to program reviews, are utilized in decision making and assessing overall institutional effectiveness. The final sections end with an overview of the ongoing institutional assessments and planned improvements that will occur over the next two to five years, which is directly tied to supporting and assessing the progress of the implementation of a university-wide strategic plan.

**SECTION II: RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND INVESTMENT IN ASSESSMENT**

**Institutional Research and Effectiveness**

With the transition to the current administration, and the creation of a strong provost function with a clear mandate for systematic academic planning, the decision was made to create a robust

\(^1\) The committee’s updated mandate, membership and structure appear in Appendix 6.I.
institutional research capacity that would adequately support the full spectrum of planning activities at the university. A consultant was retained in 2011 to work with the vice provost for Academic Planning in reshaping the institutional research function. The Data Council was created to work with academic and administrative units with respect to precision in data definitions and the implementation of data-cleansing processes that would ensure the integrity of information being reported across campus. The vacant position of director of the Office of Institutional Research was upgraded in rank to Associate Provost, and the office title was changed to the Institutional Research and Effectiveness (IRE) to align with its expanded functions, the university’s intent to invest resources into the assessment of effectiveness, and to reflect the mandate for systemic planning. The elevation of the office’s leadership signaled both the importance of this function in the new organizational environment and the expectation that the individual would routinely interact with senior academic and administrative leaders to develop and maintain systems that will afford ongoing and systematic collection and analysis in support of institutional effectiveness.

Assessment of Student Learning Committee

In fall 2010, the Provost’s Office formed the university-wide Assessment of Student Learning Committee (ASLC). In 2011, the newly titled Director of Assessment and Curricular Support was appointed and is chair of the ASLC. The initial mandate of the committee was to develop a systematic framework for assessment that built upon the existing student assessment work already being conducted to varying degrees at the university. It is now tasked with the maintenance of a robust and sustainable university-wide system for coordinating and monitoring the assessment of student-learning outcomes across the university’s degree programs.

Other Resource Investments

To more effectively and efficiently disseminate accurate data, the university has committed significant resources, $3.5 million over five years and a full-time five-person staff, in the implementation of a Data Warehouse Project. The warehouse will initially contain data from the university’s Banner (Ellucian) Enterprise Data System, and is designed to incorporate data from many other data-rich sources, such as DegreeWorks and Student Success Network (Starfish). Substantial progress has been made in the first 18 months of this three-year implementation process. The first phase was scheduled to go live in fall 2013, and was strategically selected to include data critical for reliable and efficient enrollment management planning and reporting.

Infrastructure Changes

As the university becomes more integrated, a range of administrative structures and committees are now directly and purposefully engaged in planning activities and the use of assessment results:

- The Procedure, Policy, and Planning Committee (P3) informs software and technology decisions when outfitting facilities, ensuring that instructional technology considerations are incorporated into space design. P3 works with the IRE on assessments of existing academic technology in classrooms and student computer labs.

---

2 IRE’s mission is on its website.
3 Planning documents are in Appendix 6.II
4 Examples can be found in Appendix 6.III. Both a faculty and general user assessment survey was conducted.
• The University Facilities Committee, a multifunctional representative body that reviews and allocates the use of university facilities, has been important in the planning of the new University Center, and will continue to play a vital role as university plans to consolidate continues. ⁵

• The Strategic Group, which consists of all vice presidents, deans, and several representatives of the Provost’s Office, plus the smaller Leadership Council (composed of key administrative and academic leaders), receive regular data reports that support planning and suggested resource allocation. ⁶

• The University Student Senate (USS) and University Faculty Senate (UFS) each began primarily as advisory and consultative bodies, but they have been gaining prominence in the policymaking and planning areas for the university.

• The Faculty Affairs Committee (pFAC), convened by the Provost’s Office, reviews, recommends, and develops policies, guidelines, and proposals that address issues such as faculty workload, evaluation, and review.

SECTION III: PROMOTING A CULTURE OF ASSESSMENT

The introduction of assessment and evidence-based decision making, particularly with regard to instructional activity and curricular planning, was met with some resistance by The New School faculty and staff. Securing the support and buy-in of the faculty and staff through various educational and collaborative activities has been critical in promoting the sustainability of the newly developed assessment systems.

Learning to Value Student Learning Outcomes Assessment by Doing

Formal assessments of student learning at The New School began at the program level, when the ASLC requested that all degree-granting programs articulate student-learning outcomes in fall 2010, and assess at least one of the outcomes in spring 2011. As part of the committee’s initial work, they also began to develop a more systematic and robust process for the articulation of learning outcomes. An integral part of the committee’s initial work, they evaluated a range of reporting formats and templates that would allow faculty to adopt a reporting method most relevant to their subject or discipline. The intent was to balance a range of feedback methods, which would allow for either quantitative and/or qualitative data. Consequently, the committee created templates for programs to use to articulate learning goals, as well as an annual assessment report. ⁷

Faculty Training

In addition, the director of Assessment and Curricular Support has organized faculty workshops as a means of framing the context for effective assessments of student learning, and facilitated faculty conversations in order to extend the scope, understanding, and successful integration of the work.

---

⁵ External assessments and analysis of university facilities are discussed in chapter 2. Information on the committee is available in Appendix 2.X.

⁶ The large data reports used and presented by the president for the University Town Hall discussions are one example of the reports developed and used by these groups. These are available upon request.

⁷ Appendix 6.IV contains the packet of resources the committee assembled to assist programs.
of the ASLC. As faculty become more familiar and experienced with assessment, they are taking the lead in educational workshops. An example of one such faculty-based activity occurred in spring 2013, when the ASLC sponsored a series of “brown bag” talks that focused on specifically situated assessment practices within individual programs. The nature of the work within each of these programs represents particular pedagogical contexts and means of assessment (exams, dissertations, senior projects). Faculty familiar with assessment practices led the exchanges.8

The purpose of these shared practices is to foster a growing understanding of the role that assessments of student learning can play in supporting the success of students and their engagement with their studies, as well as providing faculty with an opportunity to assess the effectiveness of their approach to their relevant subject-specific pedagogies.

**Developing a Sustainable Assessment Infrastructure**

Beginning in 2012, university-wide syllabi guidelines were distributed, with an emphasis on learning outcomes and assessments. This university-wide initiative built upon best practices within Parsons. During this time, and guided by the standards and benchmarks set forth by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD, Parsons’ secondary accreditor after MSCHE), faculty and leadership across Parsons systematically assessed student learning across all of its undergraduate programs, representing about 50 percent of The New School’s undergraduate student body. This took place during a rigorous and fully documented process that was submitted to NASAD in conjunction with Parsons’ curricular redesign (launched in fall 2013), and the assessment process was very positively received. This division’s process has functioned as a bellwether for the rest of the university in operationalizing a culture of assessment and considering the ways in which student learning can be authentically assessed in a manner consistent with the cultural practices and priorities of an institution (discussed later in this chapter). As a result, The New School conducted a university-wide curriculum-mapping exercise of general education outcomes, as well as program-level learning outcomes. While vetting and archiving of all syllabi is handled locally within each division, leadership within the Office of Curriculum and Learning is ultimately responsible for the oversight of the process. Accordingly, this office routinely conducts workshops where faculty can deepen their understanding of the relationship between curriculum design and assessment. Information on how to develop course-level learning outcomes and an appropriate syllabus is available on the office’s website.

---

8 Examples include talks such as “Faculty in Urban Policy Analysis and Management,” which shared how assessment practices in the work of MS students in Milano’s Urban Policy program demonstrate their learning through the program’s capstone project, the Professional Decision Report. Another example is that the faculty from the BFA program in Parsons’ Architectural Design shared their approach to the use of qualitative assessment methods to review senior projects in order to determine whether the graduating seniors applied and evidenced “an insightful consideration of the ethical issues of architectural design as a discipline with potent social and economic force that are incorporated into their designs.” A third example is when the faculty in NSSR’s Anthropology department discussed their method of assessing students’ MA exams to better understand student learning of the program’s four learning outcomes. They also gave valuable insight into the methods used by faculty when they review both acceptance into doctoral programs and student success in receiving external funding for dissertation research. These “indirect” indicators can determine if students can “conceptualize and translate interests into a research problem that is situated within both the anthropological literature and contemporary or historical topics.”
During summer 2013, Curriculum and Learning, a part of the Provost’s Office, launched its inaugural audit of university syllabi. The review used a rubric intended to assess compliance with stated procedures, as well as a qualitative review exploring clear and effective language on learning outcomes and assessment. As a result of this review, it was recommended that the deans’ offices and program directors offer more sustained mentorship around the design and assessment of learning outcomes. In addition, the timing of the distribution of syllabi guidelines will be moved earlier to provide faculty more time to prepare, and more workshops will be offered for faculty in crafting meaningful, assessable learning outcomes within their syllabi.

The results of the audit also provided a better understanding of the circumstances in which existing academic policies relate to attendance, how personal technology is used in the classroom, and how the academic integrity policy is in need of updating and realignment with current modes and methods of instruction.9

SECTION IV: ASSESSING INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: ASSESSMENT AND DATA UTILIZATION PROCESSES AND PROGRAM REVIEWS

In addition to the newly established annual student learning outcome assessment process, in 2010 the Provost’s Office initiated a program review process in which all degree programs and supplemental curricular offerings were required to conduct a full self-review on a seven-year cycle.10 The program review self-study must provide a comprehensive assessment that includes faculty, students, administrative support, student-support services, learning outcomes, strengths, challenges, and resources. Using internal program and administrative data provided by IRE, the report is usually written by the department or program chair and a small group of senior faculty, reviewed internally by faculty and students, and submitted to the dean of the division. After reviewing the study with senior divisional administrators, the dean submits the report to the provost with a memo outlining his or her assessment of the self-study.

The Provost’s Office then coordinates a site visit by an external team, comprised of three to five people chosen by the provost based on divisional recommendations. Following the site visit, the external team submits a written report to which the department must provide a corresponding response. The provost then meets with the dean and program director or chair to discuss the overall findings and to establish concrete goals for program improvement. One year later, the department must submit a follow-up report describing how they met the goals outlined in the process and follow-up steps.

To date, five programs have completed all phases (except the final follow-up a year later): BBA in Design and Management; BA in History and MA program in Historical Studies; MA in Liberal Studies; BFA in Jazz and Contemporary Music and BFA program in Communication Design and Design & Technology, and the MFA program in Design and Technology. Recommendations

---

9 ULECs have recently undergone a thorough review by faculty, with respect to the academic policies governing them. Continued work will take place with a faculty group in 2013–2014, which will develop learning outcomes that are particular to the educational context of the lectures. During this year the university will work with the divisions to consider learning outcomes that address other educational contexts, namely, seminar and studio. It will also look to develop policy and recommend language that supports these outcomes.

10 Review guidelines and calendar appear in Appendix 6.V.
provided by the external team from the BBA review helped inform curricular changes in that program.\textsuperscript{11} Eight more programs have completed their self-study and external reviews and additional programmatic self-studies are in progress.\textsuperscript{12}

As mentioned previously, professional programs are accredited by professional educational agencies or boards. These programs are primarily at Parsons and The New School of Social Research, and they have always undergone regular cyclical reviews that are managed by the dean and chairs of the relevant schools. At present, all of these programs are in good standing with their respective regulatory bodies and details are available on the website.\textsuperscript{13}

\section*{Assessment of Faculty and Staff}

The methodologies and systems for evaluating the university’s full-time faculty (FTF) and part-time faculty (PTF), with regards to selection, hiring, and ongoing performance, are discussed in chapter 3. It is worth underscoring here that the systematic evaluation of FTF and PTF have become institutionalized, with equivalent processes and instruments used across the university. Moreover, given the university’s heavy reliance on part-time faculty, regular performance evaluations are essential for sound strategic planning and resource allocation. An employee performance assessment program has been facilitated by the Human Resources department since 2006. Human Resources also facilitate both administrative staff assessments and professional development. Staff assessments are an annual, mandatory procedure, and standardized evaluation forms and guidelines provide consistency in evaluations. Performance assessment training is available for staff during the assessment periods, and extensive instructions and guidelines are available through Human Resources. The Human Resources Performance Reports for staff focus not only on an individual’s performance, but also on how this individual supports the work of the unit or division, and how this relates to the role of The New School as an institution of higher education. Three years ago the Hay Group was retained to run a full 360 degree review diagnostic on all senior leadership of the university. Currently, all senior administrators are evaluated annually through a criteria aligning with the recent presidential initiatives. The president is reviewed by a Board of Trustees subcommittee, which is established annually for this purpose.

\section*{ASLC and Student-Learning Outcome Assessment}

As stated above, the ASLC charged degree programs to develop learning outcomes and to assess them annually, beginning spring 2011. In addition, to ensure that programs create holistic and strategic program assessments, the committee asked them to also develop multiyear plans. As illustrated in Appendix 6.IV, only seven programs have not yet submitted any of the reports or their multiyear assessment plan, and only four of these are undergraduate programs. In fact, 55 of 64 programs listed (86 percent) have participated by submitting one or more assessment reports over the last three years, and 24 (38 percent) have submitted all three reports.

As the ASLC continues to work with established programs to clearly articulate student-learning outcomes and assessment plans, it is important to note that all new degree programs must now

\textsuperscript{11} BBA review and curricular change materials are available upon request.
\textsuperscript{12} Competed program review documents, including external team reports, are available upon request.
\textsuperscript{13} Confirmation of status and supporting documentation or most recent report can be found in Appendix 6.VI.
have learning outcomes, curriculum maps, and an assessment plan as required parts of their design.14

**Student-Learning Outcomes (SLO) Assessment Case Studies**

Many programs have used a range of methodologies and strategies to assess student-learning outcomes, with the vast majority primarily using direct measures.15 As formal assessment methods are relatively new, SLO assessment is not yet at the stage where it has influenced pedagogical and curricular planning in major ways. Programs are beginning to make small changes, and as faculty become more familiar and comfortable with assessment, SLO assessment is expected to have a bigger impact in the future. Some programs, however, have integrated formal assessments of student learning into ongoing practices. In spring 2012, faculty in NSSR’s master’s program in Anthropology evaluated MA exams with a revised rubric that reflected the four learning outcomes recently developed by the program. While the rubric ratings showed that students performed well on the outcomes, the formalized discussion of students’ performance as a group, and not the individual level, allowed for new insights into student learning. Faculty concluded that, as a whole, students drew on a limited set and type of texts; faculty expect that changes made to the core curriculum in the first year will help ensure the breadth of their students’ knowledge base. In addition to this direct examination of student work, faculty in the masters program reviewed student acceptances into doctoral programs and the results of external funding applications as an indirect measure of evaluating students’ abilities in conceptualizing research problems.16

Several departments that offer degrees at the bachelors, masters, and doctoral levels have been able to jointly coordinate both learning outcomes and formal student assessments. In spring 2012, the NSSR’s Psychology program examined knowledge of statistics at the basic (bachelors), intermediate (masters), and advanced (doctoral) levels using two direct methods: the “blueprinting” of statistics exams and faculty analysis of the statistical competence demonstrated in senior final projects, master theses, and doctoral dissertations. While the vast majority of students were proficient or highly proficient overall, disaggregating exam results into subcategories illuminated areas of relative difficulty for students. For example, doctoral students scored poorly in “assessing statistical power,” and undergraduate students scored poorly making statistical inferences using correlation coefficients. Based on this information, statistics instructors are developing proposals on how to improve learning in these particular areas with the expectation that these changes will be vetted by the department and implemented in fall 2014.17

In spring 2011, faculty in The New School for Public Engagement’s (NSPE) bachelor’s program used three distinct methods to evaluate students’ verbal literacy, as demonstrated by students in four online courses. Faculty also assessed a sample of student final papers using a rubric and obtained information through a student survey. Since discussion posts are central to these online classes, faculty also reviewed discussion board posts and developed a rubric for evaluating verbal literacy in the posts. As a result of the study, faculty recommended that first-year students take an introductory academic writing course and a fundamentals course regardless of previous

---

14 New program planning documents and guidelines are in Appendix 5.V.
15 A summary table of the results to date by program can be found in Appendix 6.VII.
16 See Appendix 6.VIII for SLO reports and plans for the MA/PhD programs in Anthropology.
17 See Appendix 6.IX for the SLO reports and plans from the NSSR & Lang Psychology programs.
experience. In part due to this recommendation, the bachelor’s program is instituting two required courses: “Pathways to Learning” and one on ePortfolio.18

An assessment project within the Parsons BFA in Design and Technology examined student projects using a thorough and well-defined rubric, and the data was then analyzed to determine students’ strengths and weaknesses within their senior capstone experience. The major finding indicated that the bulk of student work was “competent in all areas” of the rubric, with many students reaching a “sophisticated” level of competence. The evaluation of the results also indicated that the students were weakest in the area of researching and analyzing ideas from a critical perspective. This analysis evidenced the potential to revise curricular materials and to address assignment development at all levels. The report noted the need for increased scaffolding of student learning in these areas, beginning in a student’s first year.19

The senior capstone has been used by several programs as a means for summative assessment of program learning outcomes. One example is the Bachelors in History offered at the Eugene Lang College The New School for Liberal Arts (Lang). The outcomes included competencies such as:

- Command of both primary and secondary research processes
- Mastery of contextual teleological comprehension
- Ability to blend a range of theoretical approaches
- Critical writing and reflexive analysis

While each outcome was not examined in depth in the rubric, Lang faculty members involved in the assessment project reflected on various aspects of student learning utilizing a blend of both quantitative and qualitative approaches to assess the effectiveness of History senior theses. As a result of this, faculty indicated the necessity to take remedial action to address specific deficits in writing skills, potentially through the provision of a framework or defined guidelines for writing term papers.

Even though university-wide systematic assessment and sharing of results is only a few years old at The New School, Lang’s Culture & Media assessment report follows up on changes to the curricula, partially made as the result of the prior year’s assessment, which drew attention to the fact that few seniors chose the independent research option. This report looked at the success of a new course in increasing the research capabilities of the program’s students. The faculty employed both quantitative and qualitative data analyses to assess the “anticipated and unanticipated” impact of the implementation of the Cultural Toolkit course; they were also able to evidence the correlation between students’ comprehension of methodological skills in their senior projects and how this impacted their ability to transfer these skills in furthering their educational and career goals. More importantly, within the context of student learning, the faculty could see the impact of assessment results on their own ability to quickly and effectively respond to curricular shortcomings, and have indicated their intention to continue to track the progress of Culture & Media students within this area.20

18 NSPE’s SLO reports and findings are in Appendix 6.X
19 See Appendix 6.XI for SLO reports and findings for the BFA at Parsons.
20 The complete SLO report findings for the History program, and Culture and Media program are in Appendix 6.XII. The director of Assessment Programs reviews the reports in the summer, and then provides feedback and suggestions. In 2012–2013, ASLC members reviewed assessment reports in small groups, a practice that now takes place each fall.
General Education Competencies and Shared Capacities

As noted in previous chapters, throughout most of The New School’s history, students have pursued programs of study that were comprised of course offerings entirely within their respective divisions. Consequently, and to varying degrees, the skills of critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, oral and written communication, and technological literacy were usually forged and assessed within the context of the respective programmatic offerings and in relation to program-specific goals and outcomes. In 2002, the one university-wide requirement for undergraduates was introduced: participation in the University Lecture Course (ULEC) program. Although the program is cross-divisional, it is not specifically designed as a vehicle for the provision of general education courses. That said, ULEC courses are broadly designed liberal arts courses that generally provide a sophomore-level introduction to a field or topic. These courses also emphasize critical thinking, written communication, and oral communication in the recitation and discussion sections.

The University Curriculum Committee’s (UCC) subcommittee examining general education at The New School, the Shared Capacities Initiative, was created in fall 2013, with representation from all divisions and leadership from the Provost’s Office. Its purpose is to investigate learning goals as they relate to general education requirements by both state regulatory bodies and national accreditors, as well as those that are considered to be vital to an undergraduate education at The New School. The subcommittee has identified opportunities for the acquisition of general education competencies across a broad range of the curricula associated with the university’s programs and divisions. Some of these general education competency-relevant courses are elective, but many of them are required for specific majors and programs to meet the needs of students within a specific course of study.

Parsons general education learning had already been mapped as part of its NASAD accreditation. To extend this to the remainder of the university, over summer 2013, required courses within undergraduate programs were mapped to the MSCHE general education requirements. Curriculum mapping for the rest of the undergraduate programs has revealed that the skills of oral communication, written communication, critical analysis and reasoning, and information and technological literacy are taught throughout all programs. While many programs offer instruction in both quantitative and scientific reasoning, formal mapping reveals that these essential skills are not adequately taught in a few programs. In the second year of the Shared Capacities Initiative, all programs will need to review their curricula and to identify and create opportunities where shared capacities, as well as MSCHE essential skills, are taught and strengthened. Chapter 5 discusses how this initiative is being integrated into program reviews and curricular development processes.

General education competencies have traditionally been assessed within the context of the respective programmatic offerings and in relation to program-specific goals and outcomes.

---

21 To better illustrate this point, a map of the specific skills taught by each ULEC course in the past three years can be found in Appendix 5.XX.
22 To see the process developed for this assessment and preliminary reports see Appendix 6.XIII
However, not all competencies have been routinely and explicitly assessed in all programs. This undoubtedly is partly attributable to the relative newness of the institutionalized assessment process. In addition, the conceptualization and launching of the Shared Capacities Initiative will influence the university’s broader discussion and goals for general education. Nonetheless, formal assessment of general education competencies is becoming increasingly integrated into the university-wide assessment process. One example is Parsons’ new undergraduate curricula, which includes embedded general education requirements in the following domains:

- Self to World (a literacy domain)
- General Education Skills and Attributes (a literacy domain)
- Art and Design-Centered Tools, Skills, and Practices (a literacy domain)
- Integrative Design Methodologies (a literacy domain), as well as
- the first-year critical reading and writing components and
- the newly conceptualized and compulsory energy course at the first-year level

A thorough assessment plan was integrated into the planning of the curricula, and it will be implemented as the curriculum is rolled out over the next four years.

In spring 2013, written communication and information literacy skills were assessed in a sample of first-year writing courses across the university, including Parsons’ Critical Reading and Writing and in two large-scale ULEC courses. As part of an ongoing process commencing in Academic Year 2013–2014, this baseline assessment will be followed-up with the Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills test (SAILS). The SAILS test will be administered to 125 first-year students (baseline) and 125 seniors (upon graduation). It is anticipated that the outcomes from the SAILS assessment will be used to review the ways in which not only first-year writing and university lectures address information literacy, but also how this capacity is suffused within curricula in a developmentally staged manner. A sequence of first assessing the general education capacity in one academic cycle, then following up with a triangulated approach of workshops (intended to deepen faculty experience), and finally using a sampling of first-year and graduating students’ SAIL test results (as a demonstration of those capacities) is a model The New School plans to extend university-wide.

As the assessment of student learning at The New School matures over the next five years, the university also plans to:

- Fully utilize the implementation of its new Canvas Learning Management System (see chapter 2) and e-Portfolio (see chapter 5) to more systematically and seamlessly integrate SLO assessment within courses and programs
- Extend assessments to minors, cocurricular, and extracurricular activities that are not already formally assessing student learning
- Assess student learning in online and global programs (e.g., Parsons Paris)
- Perform assessments of several Shared Capacities Initiatives each year

---

23 This is discussed in chapter 5, and is detailed in Appendix 5.II.
24 See Appendix 6.XIII for a report and details.
Student Success and Student Satisfaction Assessment

In spring 2012, the IRE administered the ACT Student Opinion Survey to examine students’ level of satisfaction with the services, facilities, and programs at The New School. In fall 2012, IRE compared the relative satisfaction rates of first-year students who reenrolled for their sophomore year with the satisfaction rates of students who left the university. Approximately 90 percent of respondents who were enrolled both fall 2011 and spring 2012 semesters were retained in the subsequent fall semester or graduated, as compared to the retention rate of 83 percent for first-time, full-time, fall-entering freshmen from fall 2011 to fall 2012. This may mean that students retained to the spring term tend to return the following fall and that students are more likely to leave the university during the transition from fall to spring. Retained respondents were more satisfied with the flexibility to design their own program of study, with the access to the entire university’s course offerings and career preparation, and with the college in general. They also reported feeling more connected to The New School as a university. On the other hand, a higher percentage of nonretained respondents reported using computer services and indicated interest in access to global opportunities. This may indicate sufficient dissatisfaction with The New School so as to pursue educational opportunities elsewhere, but it may also be a spurious correlation. Further study in these areas is therefore required. All ACT results were shared internally and at regular meetings of existing groups, such as the Deans’ Council. The New School plans to use this information to continue to focus and improve the items that correlate with better retention. Student satisfaction and how it relates to retention will be assessed on a triennial schedule. Because ACT has discontinued its survey division, this instrument will be replaced in the future.

International Student Success and Language Proficiency Assessment

The New School has always attracted a large international student body, particularly at Parsons and Mannes. Through an innovative collaboration between the NSPE’s English Language Studies department and Parsons, a precollege program in English as a Second Language for international students has been established. Parsons’ ESL+Design program has been assessed for three semesters via tools developed with the IRE. Parsons uses these results each semester in their planning process for the following term. A version of this successful program, ESL+Music, was launched at Mannes in fall 2013.

Student Success and the Assessment of Retention

As previously discussed, the data on first-year retention and graduation rates indicate The New School does not have an appreciably better retention rate than the national average for its Carnegie classification, and is below many of its peers and local institutions. In response, the provost created the Task Force on Retention to study the factors that affect retention and to make recommendations to improve the rate. The Retention Task Force’s July 2011 report made several recommendations, which were implemented. Recommendations included

---

25 The full survey report is available in Appendix 4.VIII
26 See Appendix 6.XIV.
27 The Retention Task Force’s report can be found in Appendix 4.XIV.
As a result of the task force’s recommendations, the institution implemented two new systems: DegreeWorks and Starfish. DegreeWorks, an Ellucian product that integrates well with Banner, provides a comprehensive set of web-based academic advising, degree audit, and transfer articulation tools to help students and their advisors negotiate curriculum requirements. Lang students and their advisors piloted it in November 2011 for spring 2012 registration. The remainder of the university (with the exception of Mannes and a few other complicated programs) implemented Starfish in April 2012 for fall 2012 registration. Starfish is used heavily by advisors, Registrar staff, and students; and at least 5 percent of students use it on any given day. The university anticipates that the successful implementation of Starfish will result in increased retention, leading to increased graduation rates and greater reported student satisfaction.

In 2012, The New School introduced a web-based tool named the Student Success Network, using the retention management platform from Starfish. This product automates student tracking, early alerts, online appointment scheduling, and assessments to improve identification of at-risk students so as to more efficiently meet their needs. Starfish was piloted at Parsons and NSPE, with an assessment plan designed by the implementation committee in conjunction with the University-Wide Retention Committee. The product was rolled out to the rest of the university in fall 2013, and assessment of the pilot year will be completed after first-year retention data becomes available. Data from the implementation of both DegreeWorks and Starfish, in addition to retention rate data, will be regularly reviewed and shared by the University-Wide Retention Committee.

Campus Climate Surveys

In 2012, the university embarked on a climate assessment to determine ways in which various constituencies experience the campus atmosphere in terms of openness and tolerance. Coordinated from the Provost’s Office, the Campus Climate Assessment will look at the extent to which university services are distributed equitably based on socioeconomic status, race, gender, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of identity. The project’s findings will be used to inform policies and practices.

SECTION V: THE ASSESSMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS—A FIVE YEAR PLAN

From the values and goals embedded in its mission and vision statement, a more recent document detailing a university-wide strategic plan has been developed. While the goals in the plan are not
new, they have been linked together for the first time in a dynamic, operationalized framework that invites ongoing, systematic assessment. The plan was presented to the campus community early in fall 2013, feedback was incorporated shortly thereafter, and the Board provisionally approved it in October 2013. The goals for each of the five area within the for the university’s strategic plan are outlined here.

I. STUDENT SUCCESS: Becoming more explicitly oriented to preparing our students for success in a changing world.
   1. Connect and b and support across the arc of student engagement.
   2. Improve student retention and graduation rates.
   3. Develop a more robust and relevant program of career services that is highly integrated with the academic program and attuned to the changes in the career landscape and economy.
   4. Expand services and support for an increasingly international and diverse student body.

II. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND QUALITY: Strengthening The New School’s academic profile as an innovative and distinctive university.
   1. Develop and articulate university-wide and program-specific learning capacities/ and implement systematic assessments of learning outcomes and general education for all programs.
   2. Ensure that all undergraduate students have the opportunity to engage in curricular and co-curricular project-based learning experiences that address complex civic and social issues through interdisciplinary approaches.
   3. Foster and support cross-divisional movement and collaboration.
   4. Develop and launch new programs, including a suite of transdisciplinary undergraduate, master’s, and PhD programs, to leverage collective academic strengths.
   5. Strengthen our research profile consistent with the strengths and core commitments articulated in our vision.
   6. Optimize our approach to online-learning.
   7. Establish a clear institutional strategy for continuing, professional/executive, and pre-college education, and other types of non-degree offerings as opportunities to reach new student sectors.

III. GLOBAL EDUCATION: Becoming a more global university for an increasingly globalized world.
   1. Double the number of programs The New School offers in major international cities.
   2. Expand our global educational and research network and increase student and faculty mobility across it.
   3. Increase and expand international student recruitment efforts to enhance the cross-cultural profile of our student body.

IV. EXTERNAL PROFILE: Aligning The New School’s external reputation with the vision.
   1. Revise our branding and marketing strategies to effectively position programs and emphasize distinctive learning opportunities rather than internal structures.
   2. Develop a series of initiatives, to both extend our brand and diversify our revenue base.
V. INFRASTRUCTURE: Improving our financial, physical, and operational infrastructure to support our academic aims.

1. Revise the budget process to guide resource allocation with the strategic plan.
2. Diversify and strengthen the financial base.
3. Continue to improve services and the service culture to all constituents.
4. Change the way our campus facilities are organized in order to be more student-centered and promote a more dynamic academic culture.
5. Improve our technology infrastructure to support the global and distributed academic agenda, address student needs and new pedagogies, and improve operations, services, and communication.

In order to assess the extent to which The New School is achieving these strategic goals, it will, whenever possible, operationalize the action steps in measurable terms. Over the next academic year, the IRE and Provost’s Office senior staff will meet with additional institutional leadership to define and share action steps, to formalized an assessment plan, and to agree upon the metrics by which its progress will be measured. This is an especially important step for The New School as its community becomes more familiar with shared data and more centralized structures. It will likely also include annual reporting from academic and administrative divisions, something that is not currently routinized. Additionally, a feedback loop from leadership, which will review and respond to data, will need to be developed. A preliminary point of departure for methods evaluating progress towards the goals has been shared as part of the process of strategic plan development (see table below).

**Table 6.1 Examples of key ways and means to evaluate progress toward goals (January 2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Progress Evaluation Ways and Means</th>
<th>Strategic Goal Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific metrics, Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), and appropriate comparisons to be developed over the next year with individuals from appropriate planning domains</strong></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to improve our systematic efforts to gather data and widely share results related to student outcomes—job placement, career advancement, professional achievement, and employer satisfaction— including (but not limited to):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- At-graduation surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1-year out, 3-year out, 5-year out and 10-year out alumni surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employer surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Data mining of Facebook and LinkedIn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure student satisfaction, through reflective surveys and at point of service, especially with regard to improvement in areas of career services and advising, explicitly including a focus on international and minority students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Progress Evaluation Ways and Means</td>
<td>Strategic Goal Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop more robust reporting on retention and graduation rates at all levels and for all entering cohorts (including graduate, transfer, and part-time students, international students, and under-represented US populations), including participation in the “Student Achievement Measure” (SAM)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued cyclical participation in and use of results from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), especially the Learning with Peers, Experiences with Faculty and Campus Environment Themes (new in 2013) and the High Impact Practices</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to systematically implement metrics that measure university-wide and program specific learning outcomes and competencies, and assess our student learning against those outcomes and competencies.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use program review and program student learning outcome assessment reporting processes to benchmark and improve curricula.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set benchmarks for project-based learning at the student level, and collect data for student involvement against these benchmarks.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve on markers for cross-divisional movement and collaboration, including the number of minors (including subset from divisions not offering the minor), cross-registration activity, and faculty working across discipline boundaries and quantify our increase.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report annually the number of new programs by academic strength area and by degree level to measure growth and degree to which they are transdisciplinary.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a system for identifying and quantifying research proposals submitted and succeeding. Monitor the number that are inter/transdisciplinary and that draw on faculty from across divisions. Monitor the number by foundation and corporate research partners. Report on annual increases.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantify our increase in reaching new students and diversification of our revenue base by an increase in the number of, number of students in, revenue from and percent change for: online-, continuing-, professional/executive-, and pre-college-education.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic program reviews</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure the growth in the number of programs offered in major international cities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure the growth of international student body and faculty/staff.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possible Progress Evaluation Ways and Means

| Measure the growth of students enrolled at international campuses or with international partner programs, and faculty moving between New York and international campuses. | X |
| Establish means to measure and report on the mobility of students across the global portals, especially the mobility of NYC-based student. | X |
| Measure the percentage of graduates that participate in academic programs outside their home nation/cultures. | X |
| Establish metrics to assess increased international recruitment efforts | X |
| Evaluate external rankings by independent parties of our programs | X | X |
| Establish means to measure and analyze the number, depth, and effectiveness of industry, governmental, and non-profit partnerships | X |
| Measure increases in the revenue and number of people and entities involved from non-tuition based activities such as merchandising and rental of facilities | X |
| Perform environmental scanning to assess external perception of quality, vision/core values, and chief strengths, such as a metric for press mentions. | X |
| Quantify improvements in financial base (for both increased sources of revenue and increased revenue). | X |
| Report on consolidation of activities on Greenwich Village campus and completion of Parsons and Mannes moves. | X |
| Track and publish specific metrics for improvement of operations and services. This includes data gathered regularly through surveys of students, faculty, and staff in addition to business process metrics. | X | X |
| Measure quantitatively increased technology support for student/faculty instructional and research activities. | X | X |

A New Model for Aggregation of Data and Bringing Meaning to the Results of Assessments

Annual reports (oral and written) from senior leadership to the president, provost and each other will be incorporated into our annual regular meeting schedule. Reports will be brief and actionable, and focus on linking the results of assessments and changes in metrics to the goals of the strategic plan.

SECTION VI: SUMMARY OF CURRENT INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Satisfaction Surveys

In spring 2012, the university participated in the ACT Survey of Student Satisfaction. As discussed above, the results were shared with the divisions and other units on campus. Unfortunately, ACT
has discontinued that survey. The university will decide whether to administer the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) or an internal version of the questions previously included on the ACT. If the university selects the SSI, this will align with the Association of Independent Colleges of Art and Design (AICAD) consortium student survey cycle. Additionally, The New School will initiate an in-house Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey every three years, commencing spring 2016.

As discussed in chapter 3, the university participated in COACHE for the first time in 2012–2013. Participation in this consortium is for three years, and over the next two years the results will be shared and acted upon. The university will need to decide upon a participation cycle at that time: triennially or less frequently. Efforts to encourage AICAD participation, which would permit a more robust peer group analysis, have also been initiated.

The president’s service initiative was started in 2012 to significantly improve all aspects of the service culture of the university. The New School began working with a freelance professional (and a Milano Organizational Change Management graduate) on a short-term contract to develop a more intentional, structured, and sustainable approach to improve service. Appropriate assessments will be a part of the implementation of recommendations from this work.

**Student Engagement**

The university has administered NSSE five times since 2001, including in spring 2013. It will continue to do so every three years.

**Alumni Surveys**

Parsons and Milano, now a part of NSPE, have been surveying alumni for many years. Recently these efforts have become university-wide. Commencing with the graduating class of 2012, an “At Graduation Questionnaire” was implemented to survey students’ future plans, collect personal email addresses, and communicate that the university will continue to correspond with students after graduation. This graduating class received a standardized “one year out” survey in spring 2013. Results have been and will continue to be shared at both a summary- and individual student-level with alumni, development, career services, and divisional representatives through a group on the MyNewSchool portal.

**Retention and Graduation Rates**

Inefficient data organization and reporting processes led to sporadic and ad hoc reporting of entering-student academic profiles (SAT scores, high school GPA, etc.), retention rates, and graduation rates. Using feedback from the University-Wide Retention Committee, the IRE has developed a reporting structure for persistence, retention, and graduation rates. Commencing fall 2013, cohort academic profiles, retention rates, and graduation rates reporting will be produced for cohorts who entered from fall 2004 through to the present, for all degree and certificate students, including part-time and full-time students. The IRE will follow each cohort for at least ten years to permit adequate graduate reporting. Prior to this, retention reporting had been provided only for
full-time, fall-entering students. Beginning in fall 2013, The New School will also participate in the new Student Achievement Measure, which tracks student movement across postsecondary institutions to provide a more complete picture of undergraduate student progress and completion within the higher education system.

Admissions Information

The university administered the Admitted Student Questionnaire (ASQ+) in 2006 and in 2011. The results have been used to ensure that the university’s recruitment materials highlight the important characteristics shared by admitted students. For example, the majority of students reported that the availability of majors is important, thus advocating for a clear display of majors in printed materials and on the university’s website. These changes were implemented in the fall 2012 website redesign. In fall 2013, The New School hired the Maguire Company to launch an ASQ+, so that the university can align results to its financial aid packaging (an area the university believes hurts its yield of students) and to change strategies as needed. This survey will be aligned with another Maguire Company study that will analyze current and potential locations for optimizing recruitment. The university will continue to use the ASQ+ or an alternate to inform its practices.

In addition, the university will continue to collect data annually from the National Clearinghouse on where non-enrolling admitted students ultimately choose to attend. This will inform the university of its competition peers at the institutional and divisional levels. The university will systematically analyze data on competitive and aspirant peers from outside sources (IPEDS, FAFSA, CDS, US News and World Report) for market positioning. Regular reporting will commence in Fiscal Year 2015.

Program Data Metrics

Over the past year, senior leadership began using a series of metrics at the academic program level to inform strategic decisions and resource allocation. Qualitative measures (such as vision alignment, relevance, and marketing) and quantitative measures (such as enrollment; admissions rates; and yield, costs, and efficiencies) were included. This support tool will be refined over the next several years, both as it becomes clear which metrics are most informative and as various datamarts within the Data Warehouse Project are completed. The future could include items such

---

30 In the last seven years, the university-wide retention rate for first-year students has ranged from 78 percent (2005) to 83 percent (2011), while the completion rate for undergraduate four-year programs increased from 45 percent (students entering in fall 2001) to 48 percent (students entering in fall 2008). The first-year retention rate is 4 percent better than the national average retention rates for Private Doctoral/Research Universities; however, it is not as good as many of the university’s peer and/or local institutions. There is some variation in retention rates among the divisions. Parsons’ first-year retention rates, which remained in the mid-80 percent range during this seven-year period, ranks in the middle of its competitors. Lang, with a retention rate in the low-70 percent range, is near the bottom of its self-selected list of peer institutions. Mannes (with retention between 84 and 91 percent) and Jazz (with retention rates varying from a high of 88 percent in 2005 to a low of 67 percent in 2008, and then back to 73 percent in 2009) admit a small number of students each year—as conservatory programs, they have few peer institutions. The bachelor’s program at NSPE admits only transfer students, and therefore has not had adequate access to retention reports relevant to its student population.
as the percent of courses with a “global” or project-based focus, a measurement of cross-disciplinary course-taking and teaching, the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty, and so on.

The university has allocated substantial human and financial resources to develop a comprehensive cost of education (CoE) model and system of analysis. The CoE provides information at the program level, including methodology that accounts for the cross-traffic of faculty and students and the discount rate (which cannot be obtained from the general ledger), coupled with additional data that can inform resource investment and retraction. Some data from the CoE have been included with the current version of the program data metrics, and in the future more items are likely to be identified as useful.

Commencing in fall 2013, the IRE will develop an Induced Course Load Matrix Report for each individual academic program, which will detail credit hour loads by majors and nonmajors. The IRE and the Business Intelligence Group have developed reporting structures that will facilitate this initiative and allow consistent comparisons back to fall 2004. Consistent and shared reporting on the number of students minoring in each of its academic programs also began in fall 2013.

In conclusion, The New School is poised for quality institutional effectiveness assessments based on shared data resources and metric definitions. The components are in place: demand for evidence from the current university leadership; the progress of the Data Warehouse Project; the creation of Institutional Research and Effectiveness; the building of a strategic plan with suggested assessment strategies; and the creation and maintenance of Senate committees and council structures for review, planning and resource allocation. With The New School’s Academic Year 2013–2014, all these dimensions intersect to permit effective and systematic reporting, reflection, and planning as the university moves forward.

SECTION VII: RECOMMENDATIONS

- Enhance the sustainability of the current student learning outcomes assessment cycle and promote greater use of learning outcomes to evaluate and improve the assessment of student learning through ongoing identification of learning outcomes and benchmarks.

- Improve the systematic use of institutional and program level assessment results to inform planning, resource allocation and programmatic improvement.

- Develop and implement metrics, key performance indicators and benchmarks for the assessment of the strategic goals.

- Develop formal policy and procedures for the sharing of assessment information to both internal and external stakeholders.
CONCLUSION

A primary goal of the self-study was to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the university in relation to the MSCHE standards of excellence and to make recommendations for future improvement. The following is a summary of the key findings from the self-study with respect to this goal.

Strengths and Achievements

As described in the six chapters of the self-study, there is substantial evidence to indicate that the university remains in compliance with the 14 standards of excellence, albeit not without substantial challenges remaining, particularly in the area of assessment. However, along with the newly implemented university-wide strategic planning process, there is now a fully functioning university-wide assessment system in place that is linked to an explicit five year plan for ensuring its sustainability and maximizing its usefulness for planning and decision-making at all levels. In short, we believe that the university has matured significantly over the last decade as evidenced by the forging of new areas of strength and the enhancement existing areas of distinction.

Some of the more important strengths, resources and achievements that have emerged since the last self-study are the following:

1. The adoption of a new Mission statement and university-wide Strategic Plan that is reflective of the ongoing institutional renewal process.
2. The construction of the new University Center building at the corner of Fifth Avenue and 14th Street, which will provide additional academic and performance space, student dormitories, and a new home for the library. The Center is the first New School space designed to be a university space rather than one principally dedicated to one of the divisions.
3. The negotiation of a collective bargaining agreement with part-time faculty, the introduction of tenure across the university, and the adoption of a new Full-time Faculty Handbook that regularizes faculty status, rank and evaluation processes across the divisions.
4. The reorganization of Parsons The New School for Design into five schools, the growth of new graduate design programs, and sustained collaborations with the liberal arts and policy programs based elsewhere in the university.
6. The development of new academic programs co-created by faculty from different divisions and open to students from multiple divisions.
8. The evolution of shared and transparent governance, as reflected in the formation of not only the faculty and student senates, but also several other university-wide committees that bring together faculty and administrators from across the institution, such as the standing committee on university facilities and a committee on student learning outcomes and assessment.
Challenges
The self-study also identifies a number of challenges that confront the university as it moves forward in pursuit of its strategic goals and objectives. Particularly salient are the following concerns:

1. The annual budgeting process needs to be better aligned with resource allocation planning and decision-making processes.
2. The coordination between the still relatively new university-wide strategic planning process and lower level divisional planning initiatives will need to be strengthened.
3. There is a need to develop better metrics, key performance indicators and benchmarks for the assessment of the university-wide strategic goals.
4. Some of the general education proficiencies are less well articulated and systematized than others.
5. The ongoing implementation and refinement of institutional assessment systems and processes, including those associated with learning outcome assessment, are part of a five year plan for the building of a truly comprehensive, university-wide planning-outcome assessment process. Yet to be brought into this regularized assessment-planning loop are (a) the university’s mission; (b) the operations of the board; (c) the mentoring of junior faculty; (d) certain aspects of students support services; (e) the Shared Capacities initiative, within which General Education proficiencies will be embedded. This expansion of the university’s assessment infrastructure is an inherently complex process and will need to be well resourced and closely monitored.
6. There is a need for a formal policy and an accompanying set of widely disseminated procedures for the sharing of assessment information to both internal and external stakeholders

Recommendations:
The working groups, with input from the broader university community, provided a list of concrete recommendations for addressing that various weaknesses that are identified above and in the self-study. These recommendations appear at the end each of chapter and in the executive summary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U</td>
<td>Association of American Colleges and Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>Active and Collaborative Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT survey</td>
<td>Survey of Academic Advising by ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT-UAW</td>
<td>Part-Time Faculty Union - Local 7902, Academics Come Together/ACT–UAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICAD</td>
<td>Association of Independent Colleges of Art and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA</td>
<td>American Psychology Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLC</td>
<td>Assessment of Student Learning Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASQ+</td>
<td>Admitted Student Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Collective Bargaining Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAR</td>
<td>Center for Applied Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRP</td>
<td>Cooperative Institutional Research Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COACHE</td>
<td>Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoE</td>
<td>Cost of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIS</td>
<td>Design for Social Innovation and Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGE</td>
<td>Distributed and Global Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>The New School for Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE-Track</td>
<td>Extended Employment-Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL+D</td>
<td>ESL+Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL+M</td>
<td>ESL+Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbook</td>
<td>Full-Time Faculty Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEOP</td>
<td>Arthur O. Eve Higher Education Opportunity Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPCM</td>
<td>Oracle’s Hyperion Program Profitability and Cost Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP</td>
<td>Initial Concept Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td>Individual Development and Educational Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEF</td>
<td>Innovations in Education Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovations in Education Fund</td>
<td>IEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Research &amp; Effectiveness</td>
<td>IRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian School of Design and Innovation</td>
<td>ISDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student Services</td>
<td>ISS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New School for Jazz and Contemporary Music</td>
<td>Jazz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Performance Indicators</td>
<td>KPIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Academic Challenge</td>
<td>LAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Lang College The New School for Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Lang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz Part-Time Faculty Union - Local 802, the Associated Musicians of Greater New York, American Federation of Musicians, AFL-CIO</td>
<td>Local 802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannes College The New School for Music</td>
<td>Mannes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milano The New School for Urban and Public Policy</td>
<td>Milano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States Commission on Higher Education</td>
<td>MSCHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Architecture Accrediting Board</td>
<td>NAAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Schools of Art and Design</td>
<td>NASAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration</td>
<td>NASPAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New School Distributed Education</td>
<td>NSDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New School for Public Engagement</td>
<td>NSPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Survey of Student Engagement</td>
<td>NSSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New School for Social Research</td>
<td>NSSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State Education Department</td>
<td>NYSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons The New School for Design</td>
<td>Parsons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provostial Faculty Affairs Committee</td>
<td>pFAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Faculty</td>
<td>PTF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Term Appointment</td>
<td>RTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills</td>
<td>SAILS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Achievement Measure</td>
<td>SAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Budget Council</td>
<td>SBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Campus Environment</td>
<td>SCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Enrollment Management</td>
<td>SEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
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