Report to the Faculty, Administration, Trustees and Students
of
New York University
New York, New York
by

An Evaluation Team representing the
Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Prepared after review of the Self-Study Report and a
visit to the campus on March 24-27, 2014

Members of the Team
Jared L. Cohon, Chair
President Emeritus and University Professor
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA

<table>
<tr><td>Iain Crawford</td><td>Ann E. Hawthorne</td></tr>
<tr><td>Associate Professor of English</td><td>Assistant to the Dean</td></tr>
<tr><td>University of Delaware</td><td>College of Agricultural Sciences</td></tr>
<tr><td>Newark, DE</td><td>Penn State University</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>State College, PA</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td>Paul Marthers</td><td>Alan Mathios</td></tr>
<tr><td>Vice President for Enrollment and Dean,</td><td>The Rebecca Q and James C. Morgan Dean</td></tr>
<tr><td>Undergraduate and Graduate</td><td>College of Human Ecology</td></tr>
<tr><td>Admissions</td><td>Cornell University</td></tr>
<tr><td>Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute</td><td>Ithaca NY</td></tr>
<tr><td>Troy, NY</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td>Maya Sen</td><td>James F. Trainer</td></tr>
<tr><td>Assistant Professor of Political Science</td><td>Associate Vice President and Executive</td></tr>
<tr><td>University of Rochester</td><td>Director Office of Planning & Institutional</td></tr>
<tr><td>Rochester, NY</td><td>Research, Villanova University</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Villanova, PA</td></tr>
</table>

Working with the team
Catherine Davidson
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA

AT THE TIME OF THE VISIT

President of the University:

John Sexton

Chief Academic Officer

David W. McLaughlin

Chairman of the Board of Trustees

Martin Lipton
Partner
Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz
51 W 52nd St, New York, NY 10019

Table of Contents

Section I. Context and Nature of the Visit

A. Institutional Overview

The evolution and rise of New York University over the last quarter century represent one of the great success stories in American higher education. Largely a commuter school which faced existential threats on multiple occasions of the past, today NYU is one of the elite research universities in the world.

The changes have been rapid as well as profound. In less than a generation the institution has evolved from a loose confederation of individual schools to a coherent university in which all take pride in being part of "NYU." Administrative structures and processes have also changed quickly to support the increased dependence and interaction among the units and with the central administration.

NYU has, from its founding, built upon the dynamic strengths of New York City. In the 21st century, under the leadership of President John Sexton, NYU has also—more than any other university—started to connect its American base to other great and growing cities around the world, and create new structures that link continents, cultures, and disciplines in new and daring ways.

This Self-Study process and team visit came at an excellent time in this transformation. NYU has chosen this moment to look thoughtfully at the serious institutional challenges it faces in implementing this new vision, especially as it relates to linkages across disciplines and among units within NYU.

The focus of the Self-Study is on four relatively new interdisciplinary fields now being fostered at NYU. All four are multi-school and multi-department, but beyond that, each of the four presents a unique story. They vary in their origin, scope, structure, resources, and goals. Some of these variations arise because of the intellectual issues in their respective areas of focus—the Humanities and the Arts cluster, for example, has different purposes, opportunities, and aspirations than the Global Institute of Public Health. The source and extent of resources are another key factor: the Urban Sciences initiative has significant government and philanthropic support while Data Sciences has already attracted significant resources from companies.

Within these four cross-disciplinary fields, NYU is focusing on five of the fourteen Standards of Excellence; the remaining standards have been addressed in the Document Review Process. The Visiting Team has chosen to use these five standards to organize its review process, an approach that cuts across the four interdisciplinary directions and structures that NYU has offered as case studies. We hope, in this way, to meet MSCHE's objectives and provide useful perspective for NYU going forward.

A review, based primarily on the documentation roadmap provided by the institution, of all 14 standards for accreditation was conducted by two generalist reviewers, one of whom (James Trainer) was also a member of the site visit team. That review included examination of documentation related to certain fundamental elements of the five standards chosen by NYU for its Self-Study. This was completed prior to the site visit, and the report is included as Section V of this document. In the course

of the site visit, we had interviews that allowed us to augment the observations of the generalist reviewers with regard to some of the standards.

B. Scope of Institution at the Time of the Evaluation

i. **Degree Levels:** Postsecondary Certificate; Associate's; Bachelor's; Master's; Post-Master's Certificate; Doctor's - Professional Practice; Doctor's - Research/Scholarship;

ii. **Branch Campuses:** NYU Abu Dhabi Branch Campus, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

iii. **Active Additional Locations:**

- o London, 6 Bedford Square, United Kingdom*
- o National University of Singapore, Singapore City, Singapore
- o NYU at St. Thomas Aquinas College, Sparkill, NY
- o NYU Brooklyn, Brooklyn, NY*
- o NYU Berlin, Schonhauser Allee 36, Germany*
- o NYU Florence, 27 via de Bruni, Italy
- o NYU Madrid, Calle Segre, 8, Spain
- o NYU Paris, 56 rue de Passy, France
- o NYU Shanghai, East China Normal University, China
- o NYU TSOA Asia, 3 Kay Siang Road, Singapore
- o Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, NY*
- o State University of New York College at Purchase, Purchase, NY
- o University College London, School of Public Policy, London, England

visited by team members, 2014

Other Instructional Sites

New York University DC, Washington, DC
NYU Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina
NYU Ghana, Accra, Ghana
NYU Prague, Prague, Czech Republic
NYU Tel Aviv, Tel Aviv, Israel
TSOA Dublin, Dublin, Ireland
TSOA Havana, Havana, Cuba
TSOA Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa
TSOA London, London, England
TSOA Prague, Prague, Czech Republic
TSOA Shanghai, Shanghai, China

NYU Sydney, Sydney, Australia

iv. Distance Learning

There are 22 programs in which 50 percent or more of the degree program is offered by distance learning.

v. Self-Study Process and Report

The Self-Study was organized around case studies of four interdisciplinary themes at NYU; each case study was prepared by a working group and generated its own study and recommendations. NYU opted for a selected topics review with a focus on selected fundamental elements of Standards 5, 7, 9, 10, and 11. These standards were selected as the organizing structure for the visiting team's review and report.

Section II. Affirmation of Continued Compliance with Requirements of Affiliation

Based on a review of the Self-Study, interviews, the certification statement supplied by the institution and a review of other institutional documents, the team affirms that the institution continues to meet the requirements of affiliation in "Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education."

Section III. Compliance with Federal Requirements; Issues Relative to State Regulatory or Other Accrediting Agency Requirements

Based on a review of the Self-Study, certification by the institution, and other institutional documents and interviews, the team affirms that the institution has an acceptable plan in place to address federal compliance issues. The team also affirms the institution's compliance with relevant federal requirements of the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008. The team is not aware of any issues relative to state regulatory requirements or the institution's status with other accrediting organizations.

Section IV. Evaluation Overview

The team organized its review and evaluation around the five Standards of Excellence chosen by NYU; we hope this will be a useful perspective on the overarching issues raised by its four case studies.

A. <u>Standard 5: Administration</u>

The institution's administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/scholarship, foster quality improvement, and support the institution's organization and governance.

In the team's judgment, NYU meets this standard.

New York University's administration is strong, experienced, large but appropriately sized, and certainly exhibits the fundamental elements of Standard 5. However, the new interdisciplinary thrusts present administrative challenges. In addition, recent controversies have presented additional challenges for the administration.

Chief Executive: John Sexton has served as NYU's president since 2001. He is a visionary and highly visible leader who has had a powerful impact on the university. He has brought change and new initiatives, especially new international programs, and, while President Sexton is a successful and effective chief executive who leads a capable administration, his initiatives have not been without controversy.

In March 2013, the faculties of five of NYU's 14 schools voted no-confidence in President Sexton's leadership. (Of the remaining 10 schools, three held votes that supported the president, and eight held no votes.) Discussions with representatives of all of NYU's constituencies revealed a complex set of issues and tensions which played out differently in the university's many units. Among the concerns were some of the very significant initiatives that NYU has undertaken during the Sexton years, especially the Global Network University and an ambitious building plan (NYU 2031). Furthermore, some of the faculties were upset about school-specific issues.

While the votes in favor of no-confidence represented a relatively small fraction of the university's faculty and schools, the administration and the Board of Trustees treated them seriously and took several actions to increase consultation and faculty participation. The Board of Trustees created the Joint Committee of NYU Stakeholders, a broadly representative committee which gives the trustees opportunities to listen to campus concerns. President Sexton created the University Space Priorities Working Group to provide further guidance to NYU's building plans. The Working Group issued its report on March 4, 2014. And, President Sexton announced in October 2013 the plan to hold "Faculty Common Days" to give faculty more opportunities for direct dialogue with the Administration.

The sense of those with whom the team talked was that communications had improved and that "the dust had settled." Nevertheless, it will be important to pay continued attention to consultation

and interaction, including with regard to the upcoming search for the successor to President Sexton, who has announced his intention to step down in 2016.

Other Administrative Leaders: The team met with leaders in finance, academic programs, student services, international programs, and other administrative areas. All of these leaders have appropriate skills, training and backgrounds to be effective leaders.

Administrative Resources: NYU is a large university by every measure of size, including physical locations. The university appears to have an administration that fits the institution's scale of activity which has increased significantly in recent years and continues to do so. It also has adequate information and decision making systems, as well as clear lines of organization and authority.

Assessment: The NYU administration is committed to assessing its effectiveness and to continuous improvement. An outstanding example is in student services as described under Standard 9.

Challenges: The new interdisciplinary thrusts present administrative challenges that are familiar to most research universities. In particular, overcoming departmental, school, and college barriers is a universal issue, and one that NYU will have to face head-on. A major specific barrier is revenue-sharing in multi-school programs. Each such collaboration requires an ad hoc agreement, a time-consuming and uncertain process.

There are some existing interdisciplinary programs that serve as excellent demonstrations that administrative obstacles and disincentives can be overcome. The team visited and examined four impressive examples: the Center for Urban Science and Progress (CUSP); MAGNET, a facility that houses degree programs offered by four schools; the Center for Genomics; and the Global Institute for Public Health.

Suggestions

In light of the considerations noted above, the team endorses all of the institution's recommendations related to administration and offers the following additional suggestions.

- *The team emphasizes its endorsement of the recommendations in the Self-Study (pp. 83-87) relevant to Standard 5: Administration. In particular, bylaws, policies, and procedures ought to be reviewed and other potential barriers to collaboration identified. The Board of Trustees and the administration should maintain the elevated level and new mechanisms for consultation with the faculty and the university's other constituents.*

- *Particular attention should be paid to the search process for the next president. Consultation about the process and engagement by the university community in that process will be important.*

B. Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

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

In the team's judgment, NYU meets this standard.

NYU is a large, multi-school, multi-campus, international university. As such, it can prove difficult to coordinate, in a coherent way, all assessment and effectiveness-related activities taking place across the institution. While it is readily apparent that much work is underway at NYU in this regard, it may not have been as manifest in the Self-Study Report as it could have been, although, some good examples were provided.

The limited coverage on institutional assessment in the Self-Study was related, in part, to the nature of the report, which focused on four interdisciplinary initiatives. The Document Roadmap, on the other hand, provided a wealth of information on assessment and effectiveness activities, as well as numerous salient examples. However, it is not clear how this information is integrated and aligned across different levels to assess accomplishment of institutional goals. A variety of offices, working groups, and many individuals are involved in assessment efforts at NYU. Within central administration, the system of governance and consultation includes:

The *President's Core Group* generally meets three times each week to discuss and shape presidential, provostial, and university goals and strategic priorities; discussions are informed by the school Strategic Plans (discussed below). The Core includes the President, Provost, Deputy President, Deputy Provost, Chief of Staff to the President, Executive Vice President for Health, Executive Vice President for Finance and Information Technology, Executive Vice President for Operations, and Vice Chancellor for Strategic Planning.

The *Provost's Advisory Group*, made up of senior, vice and associate provosts, and senior executives generally meets weekly three out of four weeks to review deans' strategic and hiring plans and other academic matters.

The Deans meet twice a month in *Deans with Senior Team*, led by the President and including deans, senior vice provosts and senior vice presidents; and meet monthly in *Deans with Provost,* which brings together deans and vice provosts. The Council of Deans meets monthly.   In addition to these group meetings, Deans meet individually on a monthly basis with the provost, deputy provost, and vice provost who serves as the provost's liaison to the school to review overall progress, particularly fiscal and programmatic goals. Deans and their fiscal officers also meet regularly with the University's Budget Office, as described below.

The *University Leadership Team*, consisting of vice presidents, vice provosts, and deans meet in multi-day sessions three times each year, with a program of planned presentations that update the full community and present important academic and budget matters for review and discussion.

In addition to the presentation of data at these meetings, there are also formal agenda presentations of academic and other matters to faculty groups, including in discussions at regular meetings of the Faculty Advisory Committee on Academic Priorities. Deans present data to their faculty at regular meetings. Data are also formally disseminated through meetings of the Faculty Senators Council.

The annual planning, budgeting, and assessment process includes the following cycle of steps for each fiscal year (NYU fiscal years start September 1. The current fiscal year ending August 31, 2014 is FY14.):

- o Budget Office analysts meet with school and unit fiscal officers late fall through January 2014 in collaborative preparation of school budgets for FY15, and planned faculty hiring for FY16 (with a six-year projection beyond that). In February/ March 2014, the Budget Office releases directions for preparation of the FY15 budget and financial plan, including budget planning parameters and budget policies. Budget proposals are presented to the provost, deputy provost, vice provosts, and vice president for budget and planning, in formal meetings scheduled for February through April 2014.
- o In spring 2014, the Provost's office provides detailed guidance and directions for completing the school FY16 Faculty Hiring Plan (due early June 2014) and the Strategic Plan (due mid-September 2014). The plans are integrated with and incorporate proposed school budgets for the hiring year (FY16) and beyond.
- o The Provost's Office reviews FY16 Hiring Plans in June 2014, providing approvals for recruitment in the coming year with hiring as of September 2015. The review reaffirms hiring decisions for FY15, made in the prior cycle, and reviews hiring decisions proposed for FY16.
- o The Provost's Advisory Group serially reviews each Strategic Plan over the course of the fall semester in its weekly meetings, providing feedback on academic priorities and budgets for FY16 and beyond.
- o The Board of Trustees (March through June) reviews the status of the University budget for the current year, FY14, and adopts the University budget for the coming year, FY15, and projections for following years. In the period leading up to the Board's action, successive iterations of the budgets are shared with the schools and units

As noted above, the provost's detailed memos about preparation of the hiring and strategic plans provide an avenue of accountability to help ensure that schools meet fiscal goals. This year deans were asked to comment on their school's role in the global network. There is an opportunity to articulate clearly institution-wide academic goals and hold deans accountable for alignment with these as well. NYU relies on a strong tradition of five-year external reviews of deans; this process could provide an additional opportunity to ensure each school's alignment with institutional goals and accountability contributions to, for example, the university's cross-disciplinary efforts.

Individual colleges and schools have assessment processes that help determine progress towards goals. Annual Planning Reports (APR) are required of most departments in most schools, including from all Faculty of Arts and Science departments, programs, institutes, and centers each year (unless the Dean's Office makes an exception). The FAS APR was provided as an example, as were assessment and accreditation reports from other schools and colleges. The APR serves as both a progress report and an opportunity for deans to provide strategic input in planning for the next 3-5 years. Preparation of the APR is a collaboration between the unit administrator and the chair or director of the unit.

As noted in our discussion of Standard 9, the Student Affairs division is to be commended for its thorough and comprehensive assessment approach. Perhaps other units of the university could build upon this expertise, in order to encourage adoption of the discipline of assessment more broadly. Similarly, the university should give consideration to how the notable work of the Office of Academic Assessment can be better articulated and more clearly deployed in the overall institutional planning and assessment processes.

As the University moves forward with the four strategic interdisciplinary initiatives described in the Self-Study, as well as other multi-school efforts, considerable care ought to be given to planning and assessment processes to help ensure the successful development and implementation of these activities and to institutionalize alignment with institutional goals.

Recommendations to be responded to by the time of the Periodic Review Report

- As noted in the Self-Study, the university has "initiated an extensive project on the use of quantitative metrics to track departmental and school-level progress in meeting academic, scholarly, and fiscal benchmarks." The team commends this effort and recommends that NYU continue to develop and implement these quantitative metrics and to evaluate and improve how colleges, schools, programs, and initiatives deploy this information in decision-making, evaluation and improvement.

- While there is clearly a considerable amount of data collected, it was not clear to the team how consistently these data are integrated into strategic planning, resource allocation, and evaluation processes. The team recommends that the university more clearly articulate and demonstrate how this is consistently accomplished.

Suggestions:

- Given that the four multi-school, interdisciplinary initiatives highlighted in the Self-Study Report are at various points in their individual development and evolution, the team suggests that learnings gleaned from the most advanced of these initiatives (e.g., GIPH) and other initiatives (e.g., MAGNET, Genomics), as noted in regards to Standards 5, 10 and 11, be intentionally translated and transmitted to those programs that are in earlier stages of development.

- Given the wealth of knowledge garnered by the Steering Committee in the development and writing of the Self-Study Report, especially as it relates to multi-school, interdisciplinary initiatives, the team suggests that NYU continue the momentum established in the Self-Study by developing a mechanism to maintain this level of knowledge exchange and to track progress towards building these cross-disciplinary fields.

C. Standard 9: Student Support Services

Standard 9: The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution's goals for students.

In the team's judgment, NYU meets this standard.

Student support services at NYU are both centralized and a decentralized. This combined approach appears appropriate for this large, school-driven global university that is increasingly interdisciplinary in its research and teaching. University-wide student support offices are well organized and well supported under the Provost's office, and include career development, residential life, student activities, athletics, student health, multicultural programs, the LGBTQ center, etc. School-based student services operations include academic advising and, on a smaller scale, most of the same functions that are coordinated university-wide by the global student affairs office. School-based associate deans who take responsibility for school student services clearly view the central student affairs division as a strong partner. The relatively recent creation of the one-stop, comprehensive Academic Resource Center for students was highlighted as an especially positive development by the associate deans and by staff in the central student affairs offices.

There are units in NYU's constellation of student support services that are arguably models for other universities in its peer group. Chief among these is the Wasserman Center for Career Development. A recent external review of Wasserman concluded that NYU's career development programs are among the strongest in the country. This echoes what the team heard from students, faculty, and staff who repeatedly praised the Center. Wasserman provides an extensive array of workshops and programs for students interested in a wide range of fields, from media to NGO's. In addition to its expansive facilities near Washington Square, Wasserman has satellite facilities on the NYU Brooklyn campus and at the School of Continuing and Professional Studies (SCPS). In Wasserman's main facility, there are inviting spaces (including a café) for students, visiting employers, alumni, career development staff, and graduate/professional students. It appears that great care was taken to construct a career development center that would be attractive to students in ways that would keep them coming back.

In the past ten years, NYU's student affairs programs have won more than 25 National Association of Student Personnel Administrators awards for excellence and innovation. This recognition is arguably the result of a culture of continuous review and improvement set in motion more than a decade ago by the leaders of the unit. Each year, two units in the student affairs division undergo a

two-day program review, conducted by an external review team, typically comprised of senior officials from other AAU institutions. By engaging in a continuous review of its units, the student affairs division keeps itself current regarding best practices in the field and has a built-in feedback loop for making adjustments and improvements to its programs.

Academic advising belongs to the schools, falling chiefly under the purview of each school's associate dean for students. In many of NYU's schools, advising is handled by professionals for all four years or at least the first two years. In some cases, as in the College of Arts and Sciences, students get a faculty adviser at the point they declare a major. In other cases, such as Stern, faculty never have individual advisees (those are handled by professionals), but instead provide general advice to students investigating a particular major or concentration. From the perspective of the associate deans in the schools, advising works well, and most of the concerns raised by students are addressed by information they receive (but ignore) from their schools and departments. From the perspective of undergraduate students, advising at NYU is "disjointed" and needs repairing, especially in cases where students want to add a cross-school minor– a challenge that could become especially acute as the university implements the four interdisciplinary thrusts outlined in the Self-Study. Student concerns about advising have reached the provost's level and are being addressed by his office on a number of fronts: for example, there will be a self-study of advising effectiveness including a site visit by a national advising organization; the provost's council is responding to a student-led study on advising; work is being done to better integrate advising and career development; and, efforts are underway to develop an electronic tracking and early warning system that monitors student academic progress.

Graduate student advising, by contrast, appears to work well. For example, students at the Silver School of Social Work's site in Westchester County (on the campus of Sarah Lawrence College) expressed satisfaction with the personal attention they get from the campus coordinators related to their field placements. Similarly, the Center for Data Science takes a highly personal and diagnostic approach to helping its master's degree students achieve success.

The student services program for graduate students in Arts and Sciences seems well thought out and designed to help students move forward to degree completion. The Associate Dean of Academic and Student Affairs in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (GSAS) oversees an extensive array of academic support services that include dissertation workshops; language research training; teaching skills programs and conferences; a special relationship with the Bobst Library that sets aside resources and facilities for graduate students (who collectively have become the biggest users of Bobst); and, a collaboration with the Wasserman center to help humanities doctoral students acquire grant writing, publishing, and non-academic job seeking skills. It appears that some years ago, GSAS recognized the need to create a student services program to address the distinctive needs of graduate students. In this way, it appears that NYU has been a leader. For example, there is a director of graduate student affairs who has developed programs that address the mental health, housing, disability accommodation, and the fellowship/financial support needs of graduate students. This full array of support services available to graduate students gets highlighted and explained during a week-long orientation program. Finally, graduate students and staff feel that

NYU's global network circulatory system has not fully realized the possible ways for graduate students to participate. Graduate students and deans appear eager to see the GNU offer additional opportunities for study and research.

Students expressed satisfaction with the extensive array of co-curricular activities (including athletics) sponsored by the university starting with the freshman orientation program and continuing into the residential experience. It is impressive (if not counterintuitive) that a university with more than 20,000 undergraduates can guarantee housing for all four years despite having just 11,000 student beds, but the team heard expressions of dissatisfaction with the housing system from students who see the housing office as an unfriendly bureaucracy. That NYU has established resident faculty, faculty affiliate, and writer-in-residence programs to enrich the residential environment for students are welcome developments.

In the wake of several suicides roughly a decade ago, NYU invested significant resources toward improving services for student mental health. Starting with the "Reality Show" that students experience during freshman orientation, the student affairs division has sought to create an "elaborate safety net" for students in need of assistance related to mental health. In addressing student mental health, NYU has sought to be a leader among colleges and universities. Programs implemented include a hotline that has fielded more than 10,000 distress calls, a partnership with a national foundation focused on preventing student suicides, and efforts to secure roofs of buildings and close off the multi-story atrium in Bobst Library, where at least one student leapt to death.

There were concerns raised in several settings about continuing challenges and opportunities related to the diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds of students. For example, while NYU has been drawing greater numbers of Latino students, there is relatively wide recognition that further work must be done to attract and retain more African American students and more low income students. The fact that there is a vice provost position devoted to diversity efforts signifies how important this is to NYU. Now that approximately 20% of incoming undergraduate classes are from outside the U.S., student affairs officials are recognizing new challenges related to language skills, cultural adaptation, and participation in campus activities. These challenges NYU faces related to diversity are not uncommon within higher education.

Suggestions:

- *The team applauds the program review process operating in central student affairs and suggests that it continue and serve as a model for other administrative units.*
- *The university should continue to pursue vigorously its efforts to strengthen undergraduate advising, particularly in light of the expected growth in multi-school program offerings.*
- *NYU should more fully integrate graduate courses, degree programs, and students into the global network sites beyond New York.*

- *The university should develop ways to make the housing process less bureaucratic and more student-friendly.*
- *The team found NYU's initiatives in student mental health to be extraordinarily impressive and suggests that such efforts continue.*
- *The team suggests that the student services units continue to work on ways to make NYU a model university in embracing global diversity.*

D. Standard 10: Faculty

The institution's instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals.

In the team's judgment, NYU meets this standard.

The four interdisciplinary areas discussed in the Self-Study are clearly well aligned to NYU's outstanding faculty strength and expertise. In Public Health, Cities and the Urban Environment, Humanities and the Arts, and Data Sciences, the university has the significant faculty expertise and research excellence to support these strategic directions. While there are some gaps in coverage (lack of a school of architecture and a statistics department are two examples) they also present an opportunity in these areas to embed faculty resources more directly into a theme with less focus on a home school or a discipline-focused department.

It is clear that curriculum development has been an important factor in each of the four areas with significant focus on graduate and, in some cases, undergraduate education. NYU should be commended for this thoughtful approach. Educational needs of students appear to drive the curriculum. While there are undoubtedly implementation issues, such as coordinating department needs versus theme-based needs, it is very important to have the educational goals formalized prior to implementation challenges. NYU has for the most part done that. It is clear that the curricula have been designed and will be maintained and updated by faculty and other appropriate professionals. The NYU administration appears to be cognizant of the resources necessary for supporting the teaching, research, and outreach associated with the multi-school interdisciplinary programs and is investing significant resources to support this. In some examples, philanthropy is also well aligned with these priorities.

Overall, there is great excitement by many faculty with regard to the multi-school themes covered by the Self-Study. Our visit confirmed that these are faculty-driven ideas that are growing in scope and relevance for NYU. Though there have been significant debates about faculty governance over the last few years, we see little evidence (except in one unit) that this has slowed or interfered with the impressive progress on these important developments.

Department-Based Evaluation and the Multi-School Interdisciplinary Programs. The Self-Study makes clear that there are inherent tensions for faculty who are based in departments within schools, while the

university is embarking on such significant investments in multi-school and multi-disciplinary programs. These extra-departmental efforts appear to go well beyond the themes discussed in the Self-Study. The number of institutes, interdisciplinary programs, and other non-department based programs offered by NYU is very large. The main website (http://www.nyu.edu/academics/centers-and-institutes.html) lists over 200 centers and institutes with names that sometimes even overlap with the four key themes under review. Taken together, it appears that there is a proliferation of these entities, which furthers the need to understand, value, and reward faculty for their time spent in these centers and institutes, the four interdisciplinary theme areas as well as their primary department home responsibilities. That is, most of the challenges identified have to do with the almost inevitable tension between the department-based structure and the collaborative theme-based programs NYU seeks to deliver.

Many of the recommendations contained in the Self-Study articulate a need for better communication and coordination with the faculty and schools. While these are important and worthy of follow-up, the key issue for Standard 10 is whether the faculty will be adequately recognized and supported for the significant investments they will need to make in the research, education, and outreach domains of the multi-school themes. Most crucial is how these efforts will play into tenure and promotion outcomes – decisions that are primarily made by departments. Faculty – including junior faculty – are inspired by the interdisciplinary opportunities that these centers afford them. However, there are potential difficulties in the evaluation of faculty who devote significant time, resources, and teaching efforts to these interdisciplinary institutes that take them away from a pure disciplinary focus. Again, this is a particular concern for junior faculty, whose tenure votes will take place within their home department.

There is evidence at the Global Institute for Public Health that this can be done productively, and there is support from the participating schools in recruiting faculty that fit both department and center-based priorities. As these joint appointments become more commonplace and occur across more of the initiatives, it will become increasingly helpful to have a formal process for teaching allocation and tenure, especially for junior faculty. There have been examples of successful tenure promotions for junior faculty who have been involved in multiple units. NYU should learn from these cases and move forward in supplying future faculty members in these positions with the mentoring, resources, and teaching support that will enable them to be successful in navigating joint or cross-disciplinary appointments; in addition, home departments should be aware of nascent cross-disciplinary research.

In terms of the faculty involvement in each of the four initiatives it is apparent that the success and rapidly developing Global Institute for Public Health is in a more advanced stage and can be a template for success for the other three initiatives discussed in the Self-Study. The Humanities-based initiative was largely focused on already impressive structures; however, how these will be expanded to involve a larger share of faculty is not clear. The Center for Data Science (CDS) is currently up and running in terms of its master's degree offerings, yet it is experiencing growing pains in accommodating overwhelming student interest. In addition, despite attracting significant external funding, the CDS is still navigating how to provide research support and resources to interested faculty from across the university. Expanding the number of faculty involved in this initiative so to spread the teaching and research expectations seems warranted. Much can be learned from the structures at GIPH.

The four initiatives encompass in one way or another faculty across almost every school at NYU. While the faculty in Arts and Sciences overlap with many of the initiatives, it seems to be department-specific as to whether there is significant involvement. It is important that faculty from a wide variety of departments – who are deeply rooted in their disciplines – participate in these theme-based areas.

The Faculty Handbook explains clearly the steps in the process for tenure review and leaves great discretion to the colleges and units. While the tenure process is largely implemented at a decentralized college and school level, there are overarching statements at the University level. The handbook includes very strong statements on the protection of academic freedom. Titles II and IV in the handbook provide the overarching protection that faculty need to ensure that they can have freedom in what they research. This is consistent with developing faculty involvement with the broad themes discussed in the Self-Study. Title V, Section 3 recognizes that the time needed as an assistant professor to establish evidence of excellence varies across disciplines and schools. Most units use a typical seven-year window while others use longer periods before they initiate the tenure review process. As faculty across different colleges become more involved in the cross-disciplinary themes it will become important for NYU to consider how these varying time-to-tenure standards affect junior faculty. It is also essential for NYU to consider the additional demands on junior faculty time that affiliation with these interdisciplinary centers can place. Obviously, such involvement comes with high rewards; however, the concern is that it can overwhelm or derail (rather than encourage) a research agenda for younger scholars.

In many areas of scholarship it is essential to have external funds to support programs, and departments often put a significant positive assessment on faculty who bring in such funds. Ideally, associating with a theme should bring program enhancement to a faculty member – helping them secure funding, promotion and tenure. It is somewhat surprising, then, that given the size and talent of the faculty – and given the large number of centers and institutes – that NYU is not among the top universities in federal funding from NIH or NSF – the key agencies that drive much of university research. It appears that NYU is about 40th in the nation on this type of funding but has been improving over time. Given the focus on multi-disciplinary research at these federal agencies, we would expect NYU's recent investments in these multi-school themes to keep the university on the upward trajectory on NIH funding.

Multidisciplinary programs can also introduce both complexities and yet flexibility in the types of faculty that one recruits. The Self-Study does not identify the percent of the faculty that are approaching retirement, but to the extent that faculty turnover is likely to be relevant, this can be an important strategic moment to renew the faculty in ways that maintain disciplinary strength but puts more focus on cluster hiring of faculty with similar cross-cutting interests. New faculty arriving at NYU in a cohort focused on global health, for example, but hired in different colleges maximizes the probability that they will collaborate – especially if new orientation programs are organized around the themes. Another opportunity lies with the new ten faculty lines NYU is considering for the Center for Data Science.

There is little discussion of how these multi-school interdisciplinary programs might interface with the ability to hire a diverse faculty. The number of underrepresented minority faculty in departments supporting these themes is, in some cases, quite low. It seems that these cross-cutting programs might present opportunities to create synergies that would bring together – in a focused way – a larger number of faculty from under-represented groups than any individual department could be expected to recruit on its own.

There are also a large number of part-time and non-tenure track faculty at NYU, and their role in supporting these interdisciplinary themes is not clear. In many ways they can play an increasingly important role by being dedicated to the theme rather than a department because of the less complex evaluation issues (i.e., not having to evaluate for tenure). Moreover, in many of the themes, the nature of the expertise needed may be well aligned with non-tenure track clinical professors and research professors. For example, the lack of an architecture school suggests that professional architects can play an important role in translating the curriculum of the Cities and the Urban Environment theme into practical knowledge and experiences.

Suggestions:

The discussion above leads the review team to support the following suggestions for improvement:

- *NYU should consider formalizing the way in which faculty participation in centers, institutes, and multi-disciplinary themed areas is evaluated especially as it relates to tenure and promotion.*

- *NYU should consider faculty hiring within a theme-based cluster approach thus building ties to both the themes and the departments they will ultimately be associated with and tenured in.*

- *NYU should use its articulated learning goals associated with each theme to identify the role that professors in the practice, adjuncts, and other non-tenured track appointments can play in achieving excellence in each of the themed areas.*

- *NYU should consider how best to use these multi-school inter-disciplinary programs as a vehicle to attract a diverse faculty especially in departments that have had difficulty achieving these goals on their own.*

E. Standard 11: Educational Offerings

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

In the team's judgment, NYU meets this standard.

In its broad commitment to interdisciplinary learning and to establishing structures that facilitate such learning and research, NYU clearly meets this standard's call for purposeful programs of study that respond to new research findings and modes of inquiry. The four multi-school interdisciplinary programs chosen for emphasis in the Self-Study – Public Health, Cities and the Urban Environment, Humanities and the Arts, Data Science– demonstrate the rigor appropriate to the standard and evidence the central role of the faculty in leading the development of new directions in curriculum and of new lines of research. There is a high degree of energy and excitement around these and other interdisciplinary initiatives, and NYU is to be commended for its commitment to such innovative forms of research and teaching. At the same time, each program documents challenges it has encountered in attempting to achieve coherence and systematic organization and, while in part these challenges are intrinsic to the nature of a university as decentralized as NYU, they pose particular difficulties for programs that lack traditional bases in the disciplinary departments. As the Self-Study demonstrates, NYU is aware of these challenges and has been seeking to address them.

Public Health: Building on its long-term commitments to and leadership in this intrinsically interdisciplinary field, NYU launched a multi-school M.P.H. program in 2006 and the Global Institute for Public Health (GIPH) in 2012. The GIPH includes 10 new undergraduate programs, the M.P.H. and, as of fall 2014, a new doctoral program. The public health program was successfully reviewed for accreditation in 2012. Overall, the Public Health program has integrated faculty research, graduate and undergraduate teaching, and it can stand as a model for the other interdisciplinary initiatives discussed in the Self-Study.

At the same time, the professional program's recent accreditation review and the Self-Study each identify areas for focused work to strengthen the program that underscore issues facing the other initiatives: alignment of mission, goals, and measurable outcomes; student and alumni engagement; coordination of experiential learning opportunities both in New York and at the global sites; management of financial sharing; IT infrastructure; the tensions faculty members may feel between their obligations to the program and to their home departments; and student advisement.

Cities and the Urban Environment: NYU has taken advantage of its location, both in its home city and global sites, to develop a rich range of engagement with the challenges of urbanization. In the eleven centers, institutes, and projects in this field, the university possesses an extraordinary range of units focused upon one of the great challenges of the 21st century. In the context of the advent of "big data" and the fundamental changes that are occurring in mathematical sciences and their interdisciplinary role, the university, with its own commitment to data science, is perhaps uniquely placed to provide leadership in this area.

Issues of coordination are, however, even more pressing for this program than for that in public health. The relationships among the eleven units appear to be unclear, with apparently some duplication and redundancy. The Marron Institute evidently has the potential to make a significant contribution in this respect. Perhaps as a consequence of this organizational ambiguity, a duplication of programs has also occurred. As a result, while there have been efforts to create undergraduate programs in response to growing student interest in and enthusiasm for study in this area, the curricular landscape has become

somewhat confused. Unlike public health, for example, where the programs exist in coherent relationship to one another and where student advising was identified as an area for improvement, in Cities and the Urban Environment the very proliferation of the programs themselves and the overlap among them appear to be intrinsically inefficient. Although the university does also identify areas in which it has gaps in faculty expertise, a more urgent priority lies in the need to bring greater coherence and integration to the program. By so doing, other challenges facing the interdisciplinary programs at NYU – including the tensions faculty members feel between serving the program and their home department, issues of fiscal management, and the facilitation of student involvement in experiential learning and faculty research – may be addressed.

Humanities: NYU is home to many programs and faculty considered leaders in their fields both nationally and globally, and since 2005, the university has invested considerably in new faculty positions in the humanities. In 2005-2006, the provost established a task force to consider the future of the humanities. That group's report led to the Humanities Initiative of 2007, under which two new university-wide institutes were created and two existing institutes moved out of their disciplinary department homes to engage with the broader community.

Since the work of the task force and creation of the initiative, however, the humanities have on a national level, following the financial crash of 2008 and subsequent recession, become even more beleaguered in terms of financial support, student enrollment, and graduate placement. The Self-Study speaks to these stresses, expressing concerns over support and additional space that are widespread in conversations about the ongoing role of the humanities in U.S. universities. Discussions on campus revealed a more complex picture at NYU, however: while recognizing that NYU has been heavily engaged in initiatives to advance the sciences, faculty members in the humanities stressed the high levels of support their programs have received, noting in particular the number of new humanities positions that have been created.

The Humanities Initiative and the various institutes described in the Self-Study offer a rich variety of programming, support for faculty and graduate students, and community engagement. It is clear that the Initiative has been a strong source of support for graduate students and junior faculty. There has been less engagement with the undergraduate curriculum or with undergraduate students, although the Hemispheric Institute's sponsoring of the Ambassador's Club represents an impressive outreach effort to introduce students to the value of majors in the humanities. As was also noted in other areas of the Self-Study, NYU has not yet found systematic ways to integrate undergraduates into research projects in the humanities, even though, nationally, this has become a distinguishing characteristic of high-impact learning.

The formation of the global network is affecting the humanities unevenly, with some departments extensively engaged in it and others less so. For those departments involved, the initiative has created considerable administrative work and raised issues of coordination, especially around the hiring processes for Abu Dhabi and Shanghai, but, at the same time, it has also been a valuable source of discretionary revenue. What remains to be seen is whether this revenue remains under the purview of individual departments or whether it is repurposed to serve the humanities more generally.

Data Science: The proliferation of a new sub-discipline built at the nexus of statistics, applied mathematics, and computer science is, arguably, the most significant single development in the contemporary production and application of knowledge. This new field of data-centered science underlies, for example, much of the work in the interdisciplinary themes in public health, cities and the urban environment, and the humanities. To build on its impressive data-science strengths NYU launched a University-Wide Initiative on Data Science and Statistics in 2011, followed by a Data Science Working Group in 2012. The Moore-Sloan Foundation award (jointly with UC-Berkeley and University of Washington) is a strong signal of its growing reputation in data science, as is the intellectual collaboration among distinguished scholars across the university.

These initiatives have led to the establishment of six new graduate programs and the founding of the Center for Data Science (CDS) in 2013, housed in temporary space for its first two years. The Center is at a very early stage in its development and faces a number of issues similar to those facing the other initiatives but also some that are unique to it. These include:

- Concerns about the integration of applied data scholars from social sciences, the humanities, and other interdisciplinary centers into the CDS's research mission;
- The new MS program has proved highly successful, but there are ongoing concerns about whether adequate teaching resources are being provided to CDS staff to fulfill this significant, growing demand;
- Likewise, concerns among CDS core faculty – which may be particularly pressing for junior faculty – regarding teaching within CDS and how this will potentially add to their existing teaching obligations in their home departments;
- The absence of clear plans for developing an undergraduate curriculum or course offerings;
- Possible duplication in course offerings and degrees across campus;
- The current reliance by the CDS on existing NYU supercomputing and administrative resources, which may not be sustainable as the CDS continues to grow;
- Concerns regarding close industry relationships, which may trigger privacy issues as the CDS mission grows.

As the development of CDS moves forward, it will be important for NYU to ensure that these issues are addressed.

Digital Humanities: Although the Self-Study also highlights interest in Digital Humanities (DH), conversations on campus revealed that it is less formally developed and, at present, remains more a series of individual activities and localized discussions at a grassroots level. There is some uncertainty over definitions of DH and even some anxiety over its significance and implications. Given the increasing role DH are playing across these disciplines today, NYU might well benefit from a more coordinated, intentional approach to this newly emerging area.

Suggestions:

The preceding discussion leads the review team to offer the following suggestions for improvement:

- *NYU should continue its efforts to enhance undergraduate academic advising, as described in the suggestions under Standard 9, in order to support increasing student interest in the multidisciplinary and cross-school programs*
- *NYU should consider formalizing the way in which faculty participation in centers, institutes and multi-disciplinary themed areas is evaluated in relation to tenure and promotion, as described in the suggestions under Section 10.*
- *NYU should seek to find ways in which its management of space and the IT infrastructure may better support multidisciplinary, non-departmental units and programs*
- *NYU should seek to strengthen its structural support for engaging undergraduates in faculty-mentored research and experiential learning in light of the Self-Study's account of the interdisciplinary programs and the apparent absence of any university-wide coordinating mechanism for such activities*
- *NYU should seek to strengthen its organizational and infrastructure support for faculty and students working in the interdisciplinary programs, and in particular for digital humanities*
- *NYU should address the confusion and/or concern among some faculty regarding the role and availability of Graduate Teaching Assistant support for certain types of course offerings.*

F.   Reports on Additional Locations:

1. NYU Berlin and NYU London

Submitted by Dr. Paul Marthers on behalf of the team

The following are summaries of my evaluative visits (on behalf of the MSCHE) to two of the campuses in NYU's Global Network: NYU Berlin (NYUB) and NYU London (NYUL). The comments and observations in this report correspond (in order) to the meeting schedules for each visit, which are provided as appendices. I believe that by taking you through the visits chronologically, you will get a clear and accurate grasp of the richness of the educational and co-curricular experience students have at these two global network sites.

NYU Berlin

The first NYUB faculty member I met was Christiana da Silva, an instructor of architecture. Trained in design at Harvard, Professor da Silva came to Berlin in 1995 among a wave of young architects attracted to the project of rebuilding the city. As she gave me a tour of the historic and largely reconstructed government center of Berlin, Professor da Silva showed passion for her subject matter (she teaches a course on the architecture of Berlin) and a multilayered knowledge of the architecture, culture, and history of Berlin. Based on how she talked about her experience at NYUB, I could tell that she is dedicated to teaching, and devoted to her students. I imagine that the students who take her courses get an interdisciplinary liberal arts approach to the subject rather than mere technical training.

Within minutes of meeting NYUB's director, Gabriella Etmektsoglou, it became clear that she takes a 24/7 approach to her job and truly knows and is devoted to the site's students and faculty. Over the course of 1 ½ days at NYUB, I came to see the community garden that Dr. Etmektsoglou wants to establish (in an overgrown and littered lot beside NYUB's residence hall) as a metaphor for how she approaches her work as director. NYUB is her garden and she is the head gardener who tends it with great care and devotion.

The residence for the 70-100 students that attend NYUB each semester is located in a safe and convenient neighborhood. The well maintained building is separated from residential apartments by a small courtyard, which creates a sense of neighborhood that will only be enhanced when the planned community garden is created. The live-in NYUB residence life coordinator works to create activities that build community connections. Entrance to the building requires a NYU ID, and building safety and maintenance are coordinated by 24/7 staff.

The St. Agnes art facility, currently getting rehabbed, is a historic example of the Brutalism school of architecture as well as an artifact of Berlin's eastern Bloc past. Formerly, St. Agnes was a church and an early childhood center. The renovation plans call for a mixed-use building with a public art gallery to be

operated by one of Berlin's leading gallery directors. The building will have studio space for NYUB students, and the showcase art gallery will display student work alongside the works created by professional artists.

The language coordinator and instructors I met (including through observation of an introductory German class) are well educated, dedicated to small class teaching, and eager to enable their students to acquire the language skills necessary to navigate Berlin like a local. NYUB's language instructors are all native speakers trained at German universities. The classes are small and supplemented by the Tandem Program that pairs NYUB students with Humboldt University students—in order to give NYUB students a connection to peers at a German university who can help them better understand Berlin and the German language and culture. NYUB offers introductory and intensive classes in German. Students often switch from the introductory to the intensive class due to increased motivation to approach or achieve fluency. In the class I attended (an introductory section of 11 students led by Instructor Menz), the highly interactive lesson of the day focused on the real-world German language skills needed to get around the U-Bahn (the subway) in Berlin.

I toured NYUB's Academic Center (located in a retrofitted former brewery) under the supervision of Roland Pietsch, the assistant director of academic programs. The bright and airy multi-floored space has a design that projects openness and approachability. Those design features help this small site feel like a community of approachable people, rather than a collection of officials behind closed-doors.

Having taught in the large collection of academic units that comprises University College London, Roland appreciates the interactive, small class academic environment of NYUB. He and Gabriella work with their faculty to create curricular pathways that enrich the NYUB curriculum and link to the academic offerings at NYU's mother-ship in New York. The goal is to have an NYUB curriculum, where the majority of courses are cross-listed among the major/program requirements (rather than simply accepted as elective credit) back "on the square." There are plans in motion, for example, to further integrate environmental studies into the NYUB curriculum, and the courses being developed to make this happen are NYUB to Washington Square collaborations that in some cases will be team taught. In addition, next year the Tisch School will begin sending students to NYUB. It seems clear that Roland and Gabriella are also constantly looking for ways to create academic linkages to the German universities in Berlin. There are several points of collaboration with Humboldt and the Freie Universitat Berlin and expressed interest in developing connections to the Technical University in Berlin.

The NYUB faculty corps I met over lunch impressed me. Many of them have tenure-equivalent appointments at Humboldt. Although NYUB is arguably their side gig, it is clear that the faculty from Humboldt value the small classes and seminar style of teaching, as it provides a welcome contrast to how they learned and now teach at German universities. At least one of them, Katrin Dettmer, whose class I attended, strongly prefers the American approach (that she experienced as a PhD student at Brown University) to higher education. Although Professor Dettmer combines her NYUB teaching with a tenure-track-equivalent post at a university in Hamburg, she hopes to return to the states sometime in the next five years if she can secure a tenure-track position there.

The student life team with whom I met views the academic experience as the core of NYUB. Given that view, their work is focused on creating conditions that promote academic success and personal wellness. The student life team seems to know their charges well and care about them. There is a palpable family aspect to NYUB that came through in our meeting, as it did in others. A feedback loop from students to those in charge exists in the form of the town meetings that occur once or twice each semester. Because the town meetings, by design, are not attended by NYUB's top brass, they are student directed. After the town meeting, a group of student representatives meets with Gabriella, Roland, and student life officials to discuss concerns and ways to strengthen the NYUB student experience.

More so than the larger sites in NYU's global network, NYUB has room for visiting students from other universities. Among the students I met was one from George Washington University. There was also one from NYU-Abu Dhabi. Unanimously, the students endorsed NYUB as the highlight of their college experience thus far. A number of them said they love the program and wish it did not have to end. Aspects of NYUB receiving the greatest praise were the small, interactive classes, the family atmosphere of the program, and the multitude of channels available (in the curriculum and co-curricular program) for experiencing Berlin. Their biggest surprise, according to the NYUB students, was that they came expecting to use NYUB as a pivot point for independent exploration of Europe. Instead, nearly all of them chose to table that plan in favor of exploring Germany though the NYUB group trips and, when given free time, staying in Berlin to get to know the city better. The fact that students take that approach seems to be a large contributor to NYUB's palpable sense of community.

The NYUB curriculum is tied to its location in Berlin, not just through group trips and faculty and student connections to Humboldt University, but also through courses like Professor da Silva's examination of the architecture of Berlin and Professor Sigismund Sliwinski's Greening Berlin course, which I attended. The day's lesson occurred in a community demonstration garden site in the Berlin neighborhood of Kreuzberg. Professor Sliwinski's class exemplifies how NYUB's growing environmental studies program will be field-based and focused on the urban challenges presented by ethnically diverse and densely populated cities like Berlin and New York.

The wrap-up session with Gabriella Etmektsoglou showed her once again in what appears to be her default glass-half-full, accentuate-the-positive, high energy for and devotion to her school mode. As a multilingual individual who has lived in Greece, Australia, Austria, the U.S., and now Germany, it is clear that she wants NYUB students to become world citizens. While this is her site to direct, the place does not feel like it is a top down reflection of the leader's vision. There appears to be more of a ground-up, we-are-all-creating-something-special-here together ethos operating at NYUB. What NYUB has created is a culture of learning through high engagement with Berlin, built on a foundational drive for constant improvement. As a result, the educational experience here at least equals, if not exceeds, that of the New York campus.

Questions and suggestions for further exploration: While I applaud NYUB's recent efforts to integrate math into its curricular offerings, the STEM areas are still scant at this site, which means that it may be a less feasible choice for students in the recently-absorbed Polytechnic School of Engineering. Because it is small and focused, it does not make sense for NYUB to try to offer an extensive array of STEM subjects. But, given the history of NYUB's home region and opportunities to use facilities at Humboldt, it does make sense to explore bringing computer science and physics into the curriculum. Music is another area that strikes me as a peculiar omission. Plans for a Tisch-affiliated program in recorded music are a step in the right direction, as are the Tisch School's plans to bring theatre to the NYUB curriculum. But NYUB also seems like an appropriate place for a course or two on music history.

NYU London

Within NYU's global network, NYUL is one of three sites (the other two are Florence and Paris) where students in the global liberal studies program can spend their freshman year. Not counting the global network's two degree granting portal campus sites (Abu Dhabi and Shanghai), NYUL is the largest of the global sites. Most semesters, NYUL enrolls 375 to 450 students. There are also graduate programs, including a MA program in historical and sustainable architecture. Due to its large size and broad curriculum, running NYUL is more akin to a dean's rather than a director's position. NYUL's director, Gary Slapper, a former law school dean with a Ph.D. from the London School of Economics, believes that NYUL's academic program must hold to the core notion that courses must emanate either from (or be strongly informed by) the culture and history of London, the city, and England, the country.

Set amidst the academic buildings and offices of University College London (UCL), NYU London (NYUL) has a terrific location across from Bedford Square (a beautiful and historic private park) amidst the famous Bloomsbury neighborhood of artists, intellectuals, and writers. NYUL uses UCL facilities at Birkbeck College and Kings College for its science classes and has access privileges to, and part of a floor, in the UCL main library. One of UCL's schools (Oriental and African Studies) has a cross-registration arrangement with NYUL. Owing to the location and collaborations, it is not a stretch to think of NYUL as a unit of UCL. The other London academic institution that is closely tied to NYUL is the Royal Academy of Dramatic Arts (RADA). The Tisch School's collaboration with RADA dates back to 1998, a year before NYUL was established. No other U.S. college or university has such a longstanding and close connection to RADA. NYUL now has an on-site director of its Tisch programs.

NYUL has two residences under long-term lease that, when combined, have capacity for 300 students. Associate Dean, Eric Sneddon, took me on a tour of one of the residences, a building located near Russell Square and within eyesight of several UCL facilities. Sneddon is effectively the chief operating officer for NYUL, responsible for the non-academic operational areas. To handle the growth that has occurred over the past decade, NYUL has had to lease space in two other buildings that also house students from other London universities and U.S.-based study abroad programs. All of NYUL's residences are a short walk or train ride from the academic center. The residence hall I toured has single, double, and quad rooms. All rooms have a shared kitchen and bathroom. Single rooms open to the shared kitchen/bathroom area, but have doors for private bedrooms. In doubles and quads, there are two

students per bedroom. On the building's entrance floor, there is a study lounge directly across from the security desk. The lowest level of the building houses laundry facilities and computer kiosks. Building entry is restricted to NYU ID holders, the security station is manned 24/7, and residence life staff have apartments on site.

The presence of the Tisch School at NYUL is one of the site's strengths. Tisch sends 36-40 students to London each semester to study acting, television production, and dramatic writing. The acting students collaborate with RADA for a 12-week intensive immersion into Shakespearean performance. Admission to the program is highly competitive. Roughly 90 candidates apply for 16 spots. NYUL's eight television production students (usually chosen from an applicant pool north of 50) have the extraordinary opportunity to intern with the BBC. NYUL's BBC interns undergo a seven-week training module before joining a production department in a junior capacity. NYU is the only American university that has an internship arrangement with the BBC. The students in NYUL's dramatic writing program have two track options: playwriting or screen writing. When they are staged or filmed, the plays and scripts produced by the dramatic writing students feature NYUL acting students.

Before the group meetings with NYUL faculty and students, I sat in on two classes. The child psychology class, led by a Georgetown and Harvard trained child psychiatrist, was quite small, with just seven students, and revolved around a guided discussion. Every student in the class commented at least once. The money and banking class of fourteen students followed a lecture and question format. Later, during a faculty discussion that included both instructors, there was consensus that NYUL professors really appreciate the opportunity to teach such bright students in a more personalized and interactive way than is the norm at British universities. When one faculty member pointed out that it generally takes 2-3 weeks each semester for students and faculty to transition into the more active, discussion-oriented class format, there were nods of agreement around the table. The faculty also described a healthy number of examples of academic pathways back to the schools and departments at Washington Square that have been established or are in the planning stages.

The weekly schedule at NYUL is designed to give students freedom to explore the UK and continental Europe on the weekend. There are no classes held on Fridays. As a result, NYUL students are adventurous and vigorous travelers beyond London. A few of the students I met have explored more than a handful of countries beyond England. Such trips are either made solo or (most commonly) with other NYUL students. Students really appreciate the large array of group cultural activities offered. The cultural activities are a mixture of London-based outings or opportunities to explore places beyond the city, such as Oxford, Scotland, and Wales. Many of the London-based outings are thematic, such as explorations of settings depicted in classic British novels or the sites where famous album covers were shot. The only problem with the cultural outings, say the students, is the high demand, which leads many students to get shut out. The other disappointment voiced by students was that of the "NYUL bubble syndrome." Students at NYUL not infrequently feel that they do not have enough interaction with British university students. Nearly every student in the group I met agreed with that criticism, except one, a young man who has taken the initiative to join the UCL cross country team. He now has a network of friends for social outings beyond the NYUL bubble.

The academic and student support services teams expressed a strong commitment to making sure that the experience students have at NYUL equals or surpasses that of NYU on the Square. The academic support team integrates students into the culture of London through the outings (described above), an internship program, visa and immigration assistance, and the academic and information technology services provided. The student services team is focused on wellness and caring for students individually and collectively. Much of the direction given to the academic and student support units comes from the academic and student support units on the Square via NYU Global offices. That approach works well in preparing the NYUL student services team for the conditions and challenges faced by individual entering students. NYU Global provides files on all students to the NYUL student support team. At other times, NYU Global's central control of processes has led to hiccups, such as when a student wanted to print a large project and was thwarted by a technological glitch that occurred in New York. Making matters worse was the fact that no help desk staff were available (due to the time of day it was in New York) to resolve the problem until several hours later. For the most part, the NYUL staff seems to appreciate the benefits accruing from NYU Global's standardization of systems. But the word "monitoring," which came up more than once, suggests that there is some nostalgia for a not long ago era when sites like NYUL felt they had more autonomy.

The wrap-up discussion focused primarily on where NYUL plans to head in the future. Gary Slapper, NYUL's director, believes that the site is scalable, if plans call for expansion of enrollment and curricular offerings. Among the global study sites, NYUL has perhaps the highest combined demand from students seeking to study there and from faculty seeking to teach or do research there. In other words, the demand, as measured by the numbers of NYU students and faculty wanting to go to London, far exceeds the supply of available opportunities. All of this means that NYUL has a strong foundation for continued success.

So where will and should NYUL head in the future? There are plans to develop a partnership with London Contemporary Dance and offer summer courses in dance at NYUL. There are discussions about the possibility of expanding public health at NYUL to become part of a global master's of public health (MPH) program that would have four sites spanning continents: Accra, Ghana; Buenos Aires; London; and Sydney. Discussions are also ongoing about the potential to introduce digital media and gaming courses at several of NYU's global sites, and NYUL is on that list. What is less clear is where NYUL will be heading with its science curriculum. The pre-med (including biology, chemistry, and physics courses) and public health tracks offered at NYUL are thriving. But there are no clear plans regarding how to expand the STEM offerings at NYUL to attract students from NYU's Polytechnic School of Engineering. We discussed several possibilities, including some that drew an enthusiastic response from NYUL's director. Chief among those were computer science, information technology, and data science. Outside of the STEM areas, the NYUL director appears keen on building the music curriculum, especially related to music history and the contributions made by British composers and musicians as diverse as Benjamin Britten, Gilbert and Sullivan, the Beatles, and the Clash. In addition, there was enthusiasm for an economics course that would contrast the theories of two great British thinkers, John Maynard Keynes and Adam Smith. Indeed, there is no lack of inspired curricular ideas coming from NYUL's director.

Questions and suggestions for further exploration: NYUL is on the right track in contemplating possibilities for curricular expansion presented by various schools and academic departments. Expanding course offerings related to music and intellectual history (as discussed above) is a good idea and can be pursued swiftly. Efforts to expand the STEM offerings to make them attractive to a wider array of NYU students, including those from the School of Engineering, should also be pursued. At present that discussion lacks urgency and is being driven largely by the School of Engineering and other academic departments on the London Site Specific Advisory Committee.. There needs to be more urgency brought to that discussion and greater opportunity for NYUL to chart its course in the STEM area. Relying on NYU-Abu Dhabi and NYU-Shanghai as the hubs for serving the needs of STEM-interested students (the current default position of the School of Engineering) will not be sufficient. Just as NYU-Paris is getting strong attention from the NYU Global leadership and departments in planning for STEM curriculum possibilities, so too should NYUL. Areas noted above, such as computer science, data science, and information technology, bear further exploration for NYUL. It also seems like a good idea for NYUL to determine if any of the engineering disciplines can be featured there as well. On the student experience side, NYUL would do well to address student concerns related to lack of interaction with British college students. Providing more points of connection with UCL students will only improve the NYUL student experience. Overall, however, NYUL is an impressive site in an attractive and strategic location, with high quality faculty, bright students, and excess demand. I have little doubt that the quality of the student experience there at least equals, if not exceeds, that offered back in New York.

2. Visit to the Silver School of Social Work's Westchester (NY) Campus at Sarah Lawrence College

Submitted by Dr. Ann Hawthorne on behalf of the team.

The team believes the Silver School of Social Work at the additional location in Westchester County (at Sarah Lawrence College) meets all five standards of administration, institutional effectiveness, faculty, student services, and educational offerings.

The Westchester location is integrated with Washington Square in important ways. They are a single faculty with one hiring and promotion process and one strategic plan. Students are admitted first to the School of Social Work and then choose their campus location after admission. All core courses are offered at both Westchester and Washington Square to accommodate student accessibility, but share common syllabi. The Westchester campus is taking particular note of the School's strategic planning goal of diversity and social justice.

Twenty years ago the Silver School rented space from Sarah Lawrence College to take advantage of a market opportunity. It's a small campus with a location convenient to those that live closer to Westchester County and surrounding areas. It was opened initially to accommodate part time students who preferred the Westchester County location. They currently enroll 80 students of all ages and career stages. They enjoy a stable faculty, two of whom serve as campus coordinator and assistant campus coordinator while also teaching, advising students, and conducting research. They are blessed with an intimate setting and the strong enthusiasm of both faculty and students. Seminar classes are offered in

five classrooms in the same building and one classroom in another building. The school is clearly committed to the site, demonstrating support by ensuring that they have enough resources.

The school's co-location with Sarah Lawrence College has provided the opportunity for shared student services. Sarah Lawrence has opened their writing center, library, guest lectures, and gymnasium to Silver students. Students take advantage of NYU's career development services downtown but resume writing and alumni panels are offered at Westchester as well. Students are satisfied with advising at the Westchester Campus. The campus coordinator conducts all pre-field advisement, with the assistant campus administrator conducting all field advisement.

Visit to School of Engineering, CUSP, and MAGNET in Brooklyn, NY

Submitted by Dr. Jared Cohon and Catherine Davidson on behalf of the team

Jared Cohon and Catherine Davidson met with leadership of the School of Engineering, including the Dean and, in a separate session, three associate deans. While Poly is not formally included in the 2014 Self-Study since the school joined NYU only in January 2014, it is integral in several multi-school collaborations. Integration with the main campus has, de facto, been phased in since 2007, and the group expressed overall satisfaction with the transition to NYU, with the university's investment in the Brooklyn campus, and with the growing connections to Washington Square. Poly is led by a strong dean with an outstanding reputation. His vision and his determination to build on what is already a solid foundation bode well for the future of Poly as NYU's Engineering School.

The Center for Urban Science and Progress was founded in 2012, and admitted their first master's class in urban informatics in September 2013. This ambitious program is a public-private partnership with New York City and NYU, and aims to use newly available data to inform policy and understanding of issues affecting cities. CUSP crosses the urban and data science initiatives covered in the Self-Study, although it seems very much its own entity and not geared to building formal linkages within NYU, at least initially. There appear to be no formal connections to the Marron Institute, for example, nor to the new Data Science programs. CUSP has held a number of problem-oriented research workshops over the past year which have attracted wide attention and interested many new partners on the research side. The master's degree students rated the education program highly, praising its integration of technical skills with broader social issues. Overall the group was excited and ambitious about CUSP's potential.

The new Media and Games Network (MAGNET) opened in fall 2013, and houses electronic gaming-related degree programs from four colleges (Tisch, Courant, Steinhardt, and Engineering). While each degree program is intended to retain its distinctive emphasis, faculty leaders were enthusiastic and energized by this sharing of space and the benefits it has already brought. They reported no tensions or concerns in crossing college boundaries and were optimistic about the positive momentum that NYU could realize from this arrangement. This is a true interdisciplinary success story that the university can hold up as a positive example of what is possible.

Section V. Compliance with Accreditation Standards

We include in this section the report prepared by the generalist reviewers. The team endorses this report which, in concert with the comments on the five selected standards noted in this report, supports the conclusion that the New York University appears to meet all 14 Standards of Excellence.

New York University
Middle States Self-Study
Document Review
October 2013/March 2014

New York University elected to conduct a *selected topics* Self-Study in pursuit of its decennial accreditation review by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. By choosing this route, certain Standards of Excellence were addressed in the Self-Study itself, while others were examined through a document review process. The Self-Study, which focused on four case studies of interdisciplinary initiatives and activity at NYU, specifically covered Standards 5, 7, 9, 10, and 11. The remaining nine standards were included in the document review process. However, the document review did provide some information on certain aspects of even those standards that would be included in the Self-Study.

The document review for NYU occurred in three phases. First, two generalists reviewers, Margaret Plympton of Lehigh University and James Trainer of Villanova University, visited NYU on October 28-29, 2013. At that time, they pursued and reviewed documents that had been shared with them via a document roadmap. The document roadmap contained information on all 14 standards, although it focused on the nine standards not addressed in the Self-Study. After their review, the generalist reviewers concluded that the University was, in their opinion, in compliance with each of the nine standards fully addressed through the document review. The reviewers also suggested to NYU documents and updates that they felt would be helpful to provide to the full Visiting Team when it came to campus at the end of March 2014 for its evaluation visit and counseled the University as to documents and information that would be needed to strengthen the evidence that would be provided related to the standards addressed in the Self-Study. In stage two of the review, NYU updated the document roadmap and shared documents with the generalist reviewers that supplemented materials shared via the initial roadmap and visit. In particular these updated items focused on strengthening the evidence related to certain fundamental elements of standards 5 and 7. Finally, in the third step in this process, James Trainer had the opportunity to consider additional materials the University provided to the full Visiting Team when he returned to NYU with the team for the team visit on March 25-27, 2014.

The following pages contain an analysis based on all three phases of the document review process. **[Bracketed bold text]** following individual follow-up items/suggestions at the end of the sections on each standard covered in the document review, provides an update on the disposition of said item throughout the final two phases of the review process.

STANDARD 1: MISSION AND GOALS

The institution's mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and indicates who the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission and goals are developed and recognized by the institution with the participation of its members and its governing body and are used to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness.

In the reviewers' judgment, NYU meets this Standard.

Discussion

As would not be surprising for an institution of NYU's scope and complexity, the University-wide mission statement is a very high level aspirational statement:

New York University's mission is to be a top quality international center of scholarship, teaching and research. This involves retaining and attracting outstanding faculty who are leaders in their fields, encouraging them to create programs that draw outstanding students, and providing an intellectually rich environment. NYU seeks to take academic and cultural advantage of its location and to embrace diversity among faculty, staff and students to ensure a wide range of perspectives, including international perspectives, in the educational experience.

In addition, each of the Schools, and many departments, institutes, programs, and governance groups also has a mission statement, more tailored to the particular nature of each unit. Many of these are easily accessible through the University's websites, while a few are in a protected domain, or are reproduced in more specialized settings (i.e. on the application form for the school).

As with the mission statements, goals are found in a variety of settings for many of the units at the university, and are doubtless used to a greater or lesser extent for planning in those different areas. (More information on planning processes is included in the Standard 2 commentary, and on the larger governance structures of the University under Standard 4.)

Follow-up items/Suggestions

- The team noted that there did not appear to be any description of the process by which such statements are drafted, updated, vetted or finally "approved" at the institution; this is likely because mission statements by their nature do not frequently change, but articulating such a process might be of value to the community, as much for transparency of intent as for any actual anticipated changes being put forth. **[This issue is addressed, in part, in the Visiting Team's report in various sections addressing Standards 5 and 7.]**

STANDARD 2: PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION, AND INSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL

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

In the reviewers' judgment, NYU meets this Standard.

Discussion

The Framework 2031 and related Strategy for Future Growth documents lay out ambitious plans for the future of NYU. While the version of the Framework document that was provided to the team is dated 2008, the introduction states that it is a draft, and later points out that it is not a strategic plan with academic priorities, but rather lays out some guiding principles for the future crafting of more detailed and specific plans. (Note: One of the governance challenges that NYU faces is strong resistance from many faculty members in the community to the Framework document itself.)

The Strategy for Future Growth is a very high level document, yet many of the facilities changes articulated there have already been taken on, and indeed some of those projects are already completed. The use of the Space Priorities Working Group to assist in articulating and vetting such actions may have contributed to the institution's ability to make this kind of progress, relatively smoothly.

Subsequent reports, such as the President's priorities for the 13-14 academic year, focus attention on key activities (the merger with NYU Poly, fundraising for financial aid, and addressing governance concerns, for example), though the Framework is still mentioned as an overarching reference point.

Individual schools and departments are required to submit annual plan documents, articulating goals, staffing needs, resource requests, and showing 3-5 year financial projections. These documents do not appear to be easily "summed up" into a single institutional plan, although there are University-level financial projections available. [these projections are discussed further in Standard 3]

There are also annual reports from a number of units included for review, with quite a variety of levels of detail and information provided.

The NYU By the Numbers report provides a variety of different types of data to the broader institutional community, some at a very high level, but with more detailed information searchable as well. It is unclear whether this level of information is used extensively by the institutional community, but certainly it could be, though of course there is a lag in the timeliness of the reports.

Follow-up items/Suggestions

The visiting team should request any updates or specific priority-setting documents that have grown out of the Framework 2031 and Strategy for Future Growth work at NYU. **[Items related to this issue were**

shared. In particular, the report of the University Space Priorities Working Group issued in March, 2014 was shared, given that space related issues are at the heart of the Framework 2031 document.]

STANDARD 3: INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES

The human, financial, technical, physical facilities and other resources necessary to achieve an institution's mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution's mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution's resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcomes assessment.

In the reviewers' judgment, NYU meets this Standard.

Discussion

Human Resources

Human Resource policies were assessed in 2008-2009 by the HR Policy Assessment Task Force, though that group did not appear to comment on the allocation of human resources, but rather on the institutional policies that affect individual employees and operating units.

Financial Resources

The most recent version of the NYU Financial Summary is labeled October 2013, and is still in draft, providing information on the 2011-2012 Fiscal Year end results. The report includes comparison data with other institutions in some areas, as well as information on changes over time at NYU. This report consolidates all activities of the University, including the Washington Square campus, the Medical Center campus, and the many international affiliates as well. Consistent with previous years, the University ended the year with a return to net assets of approximately 6% of total revenues, demonstrating a healthy financial position, overall.

The report notes that the University is more tuition-dependent than many of its peer institutions, due to its significantly smaller endowment base. This necessarily focuses much institutional attention on the academic programs and ensuring their relevance to current and future enrolled students, while also providing focus to the recently-announced fundraising campaign, seeking to raise $1 billion for financial aid. Success in this campaign will be important for NYU, since the net cost to each undergraduate student is on the higher side.

Not surprisingly, given the University's size, there are a variety of groups who provide input and advice on the distribution of institutional resources. The Financial Affairs Committee of the University Senate, and the Finance and Policy Planning Committee of the Faculty Senators Council are two of the on-campus groups, and of course the Board of Trustees has a Finance Committee that ultimately must approve the institution's annual operating and capital budgets. The final version of the University's budget is posted on the institutional website, providing a good level of transparency for those who wish to better understand what resources are being allocated to which priorities in a given fiscal year.

The University maintains a multi-year financial planning tool, of necessity created at a very high level, using 6 revenue assumptions and 4 expense assumptions. Although there are positive operating margins throughout the projections, the assumptions necessary to support the University's anticipated capital investments could affect these results. Careful analysis to ensure that the projections fully reflect anticipated investments in both operating and capital needs would be valuable.

<u>Technology Resources</u>

Technology planning is a priority for a variety of different units and committees at NYU. As with other challenges, the coordination and compilation of all of this feedback into a coherent plan will require extensive effort on the part of the University, most likely led by the newly appointed Vice President for University Enterprise Initiatives.

<u>Physical Resources</u>

The University Space Priorities Working Group has provided interim reports over the last year, and is expected to issue a comprehensive report in December 2013. This report could be a valuable tool in assessing the University's ability to choose among competing physical space priorities, and dedicating this precious research to the highest priority needs of NYU.

Follow up items/Suggestions

- The visiting team should request whatever information is available for FY13 financial results, though the final report may not yet be available. **[a summary update was provided]**
- Although the "Financial Governance Processes" document provides useful data on the quality of service and other initiatives within the finance area, it does not in fact, describe the governance processes that guide the University's financial choices. Given the variety of interested groups in this topic, creating such a process description might serve the institution well. **[This issue is addressed, in part, in the Visiting Team's report in various sections addressing Standards 5 and 7.]**
- The visiting team should request a copy of the University Space Priorities Working Group comprehensive report, to be issued in December 2013. **[the report issued in March, 2014 was shared]**

STANDARD 4: LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE
The institution's system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. The governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.

In the reviewers' judgment, NYU meets this Standard.

Discussion

The governance structure of the University is well-described in the variety of documents that were made available to the team. At this particular moment in NYU's history, governance is a topic of much interest to many on the campus, and with the variety of task forces and reports that have been put together, the University has the opportunity to materially enhance the governance bodies that currently exist, and/or to create new bodies that will better meet the needs of the entire institution.

The multi-layered structure of the University Senate, with each major constituency group then having a Council, supplemented by elected faculty structures in many of the schools (or committee of the whole meetings, in some smaller units), creates a multitude of potential advisory/deliberative bodies to be called upon by the institution when needed. In addition, other non-governance groups (such as the Provost's Advisory Committee) could create additional confusion concerning roles and responsibilities. Further clarity around which group(s) will be consulted on which issues, and what the nature of the consultation will be, might be helpful.

Clear handbooks exist for the Board of Trustees, the Faculty, and Employees, and the websites for each of the deliberative bodies identify the names and roles of all members. Should members of the community wish to be directly engaged with these groups, the information is available for them to become engaged. It is less clear whether the meetings themselves would be opportunity for community engagement, and recent information about whatever topics have been most recently discussed doesn't appear to be easily available.

The Board of Trustees has an appropriate Conflict of Interest policy, (though it is not included in the current version of the Handbook, which might be an easy enhancement to the usefulness of that document), and has been a significant financial support for the University as well. The Board is large, but as long as the individual Committee structure works well, the size of the full Board will be less of an issue.

The formation of the Joint Committee of NYU Stakeholders, as a result of the Board's formation of a Special Committee in response to the concerns raised in the Faculty Senators Council Memo on Shared Governance, is just underway. Indeed, the Joint Committee's first meeting is scheduled for the beginning of November. Ensuring that the work of this body leads to substantive enhancement in the perceived value of the institution's governance structures will be key to NYU's continued forward progress.

Follow up items/Suggestions

- The visiting team should request updated minutes from the most recent Senate and Council meetings, as only documentation from the previous academic year was available for the fall generalist visit. **[updates were provided]**
- The visiting team should request an update on the work of the Joint Committee. **[Two meetings of the Joint Committee have been held commencing in Fall 2013 and materials were provided**

related to those meetings, including meeting announcements and invitations, agenda, and meeting notes, and shared with the visiting team.]

STANDARD 6: INTEGRITY

In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support for academic and intellectual freedom.

In the reviewers' judgment, NYU meets this Standard.

Discussion

The University has laid out clear policies and procedures for all members of the community, and includes this information in handbooks and on websites, for broad distribution to anyone who would need this material.

The Office of Compliance and Risk Management is to be commended for the comprehensive and current information included in its reports and analyses. With regular access to the Board of Trustees Audit Committee, this office and its working groups could easily raise significant issues immediately to the governing board, and given the quality of the work provided to the Team, they are clearly well-equipped to identify any potential breaches of the institution's standards.

The University is to be commended that the Faculty Handbook opens with a letter from the President, followed immediately by a strong statement on Ethical Commitment. This clearly sets a tone for all users of the Handbook, and demonstrates the priority that NYU attaches to ethical behavior in all settings.

All MSCHE-related information is available and up to date, and the current Accreditation website includes historical information that may be of interest to the community.

Follow up items/Suggestions

- The University's Policy on Policies lays out an overarching framework for the creation and updating of any institutional policies, or unit-specific policies. The team noted that this Policy did not clearly articulate when broad institutional consultation would be called for, other than mentioning the Faculty Senate consultation for Faculty Handbook items. Perhaps, given the complexity of NYU, such guidance would not be able to be crisply described, but if it were possible, the Policy would be that much more useful, as all could plan on which items would be going through which governance bodies for review, before the ultimate approval (or rejection) that is described clearly. **[During the site visit in March, the Visiting Team remained attuned to this issue. It is addressed in the section covering Standard 5. In that section it is noted that the NYU Administration appears to have become increasingly consultative of late. The Visiting Team suggested that the University be careful to ensure that the process to identify the next President for NYU be open and inclusive in engaging the university community in the search process.]**

- The team noted that the Principles and Procedures for Dealing with Allegations of Research Misconduct was posted, but with no issuing date, responsible officer, or issuing authority. This is probably just a website update issue, but given the importance of this policy in a research university setting, complete identification of the policy would be wise. **[This observation was relayed to the University]**

STANDARD 8: STUDENT ADMISSIONS AND RETENTION

The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission and seeks to retain them through the pursuit of the students' educational goals.

In the reviewers' judgment, NYU meets this Standard.

Discussion

NYU occupies a unique a place in the landscape of American higher education. Although the largest of private American universities, with nearly 50,000 students, it is at the same time one of the most competitive, selective, and highest ranked of all institutions. NYU attracts students from throughout the country and across the globe to study at its campuses in New York, Abu Dhabi, and Shanghai, as well as in programs located at an additional 14 international sites. Degrees are granted from the Associates and Postsecondary Certificate level all the way through the Bachelors, Masters, and Doctoral Degree levels (both professional and research doctorates are granted).

Admissions information is readily available and accessible for prospective students on the University's website. Admissions criteria and expectations for students are clearly articulated. At the undergraduate level, NYU received more than 48,000 applications for Summer/Fall 2013 admission, admitted fewer than 35% of these applicants, and enrolled an entering class of approximately 5,100 first-time, full-time first year students. Seventy-eight percent of entering students submitted SAT scores while 35% submitted ACT scores. Undergraduate students are admitted through both regular and early decision admissions programs. Approximately 700 transfer students enroll annually. Fifty percent of all undergraduate students receive some type of financial assistance to attend NYU, and 21% of students are Pell eligible.

Ninety-two percent of students are retained to the second year and eventually 84% of entering students graduate within six years. African-Americans, who make up approximately 5% of the entering class, are somewhat less likely to graduate in six years with a six-year graduation rate of 79%.

Follow-up items

- At the time of the Generalists' visit in October 2013, information related to the reporting requirements of the Higher Education Opportunities Act (HEOA) was not readily found**. [This information was subsequently made available to the reviewers. It is recommended, however, that a link to a landing page for all of this information be placed on the University's homepage or within one to two clicks of this page in that at present this information is distributed across the University's website.]**

STANDARD 12: GENERAL EDUCATION

The institution's curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, and technological competency.

In the reviewers' judgment, NYU meets this Standard.

Discussion

While all undergraduate programs at NYU are rooted in a strong tradition in the Liberal Arts, as was noted in the Document Roadmap, "several general education models coexist at NYU, reflecting the academic diversity of the campus." All schools have an expository writing requirement. Approximately ¾ of all undergraduates participate extensively in a humanities/social science component, but schools vary greatly in their mathematics and natural science requirements and only two of twelve have a foreign language requirement. Information on the general education requirements, including credits, across the various schools was readily accessible.

A recently revised College Core Curriculum in the College of Arts and Sciences (formerly the Morse Academic Plan) "provides a foundational academic experience of general education in the liberal arts." Courses are designed to prepare students for work in their major programs of study as well as in their later careers. In addition to their studies on NYU's main campus in NYC, over 40% of undergraduates study abroad at some point during their academic careers. A Liberal Studies Program, as well as a Global Liberal Studies Bachelor of Arts Degree is available. The College Core Curriculum has four components: Foundation of Contemporary Culture; Foundations of Scientific Inquiry; Expository Writing; and Foreign Language. Changes in the core curriculum were driven by a review of the program initiated in 2008.

STANDARD 13: RELATED EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The institution's programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards.

In the reviewers' judgment, NYU meets this Standard.

Discussion

While students entering NYU are expected to be prepared to do college-level work, there are two pre-college New York State funded opportunity programs to help prepare students for college and two college level New York State funded opportunity programs. Non-credit courses are offered through the NYU School of Continuing and Professional Studies (SCPS). Course offered through SCPS are reflective of NYU being "in and of the city." Credit, non-credit, and certificate programs alike have clearly stated learning goals and objectives and are assessed along with all other programs. Internship and experiential learning programs are available to NYU students and the Gallatin School of Individualized

Study allows undergraduate students to earn a maximum of 32 course equivalent credits for professional experiences they gain before enrolling in Gallatin.

As NYU has developed into a "Global Network University," with campuses and programs around the globe, faculty in New York have retained oversight of related academic offerings. Documents related to this process are available and were reviewed. All programs are assessed and assessment reports are available. There is a Faculty Advisory Committee on the NYU Global Network and a Global Network University Initiative Committee.

Distance learning programs are offered through SCPS and the Law School. Few undergraduates participate in distance learning opportunities. There are 22 programs where 50% or more of the curriculum is offered through distance learning. Technology and other services are provided to all NYU students regardless of location or mode of instructional delivery. NYU is currently piloting an open education project under the auspices of a Provost's initiative.

STANDARD 14: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

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

In the reviewers' judgment, NYU meets this Standard.

Discussion

NYU has a strong and sustained commitment to student learning outcomes assessment. Assessment activities are pursued for co-curricular and traditional academic programs alike. Indeed, the robust assessment and evaluation work conducted in Student Affairs, through the Office of Research and Assessment for Student Affairs (ORASA), may serve as a model for others at NYU and elsewhere.

Assessment work is well coordinated and supported, while clearly recognized as an activity that must be owned and driven at the department and faculty level, especially within a highly decentralized university. There is an Office of Academic Assessment (OAA) under the purview of the Provost's Office, with Assessment Council Liaisons identified for each of the schools and colleges. All told, 57 individuals are engaged with this Council. An assessment plan is in place and updated annually. Each academic program is expected to submit an annual assessment update to the OAA, which reports where the program stands on assessment as well as what assessments have taken place in that year and how assessment results have been used. Each program is expected to assess at least one outcome per year, in the hopes that in a five to seven year cycle everything within a program will have been accessed. A combination of direct and indirect assessment measures are deployed across the university.   An annual "assessment of assessment" is undertaken, which includes an analysis and content coding of the assessment reports submitted to the OAA. As these submissions are analyzed, annual goals and plans for assessment activities are set. The OAA evaluates and provides feedback to academic departments on their assessment activities. Volumes of data and assessment reports were made available for review.

Not surprisingly, assessment is further advanced in some academic areas than it is in others. Indeed, the OAA's recent goals include continuing to work to divorce assessment expectations and activities from accreditation and to continue to build an understanding of the pedagogical benefits of assessment. There is also a desire to engage students in informing the assessment process, rather than merely being a focus of assessment. Assessment results are employed to inform curriculum review and improvement; however, they could be deployed more formally and fully deployed in the Academic Program Review process. Assessment workshops are held to help facilitate and advance assessment and to share assessment techniques and lessons learned. The OAA is engaged with the University's "Teaching with Technology" effort and there is some discussion of pursuing a *learnings analytics* initiative.

An issue that came up in the preliminary review of documents that took place in October relative to Standards 5 and 7, which were both also addressed in the selected topics Self-Study, was a discussion about Dashboards that were being developed for the University. At the time of the generalists' document review, the generalists offered the following:

The Visiting team should request University Dashboard information that includes the underlying data that the Dashboard includes. As noted in an earlier Standard, the information provided to the team appears to be the description and instructions for using the Dashboard, but does not seem to have the actual numbers included. **[The Dashboard was shared with the Visiting Team during its March site visit, and the Team recommended, within its analysis related to NYU's compliance with Standard 7, that the Dashboard be more broadly used and disseminated across the University.]**

Section VI: Summary of Recommendations and Suggestions Requiring Follow-Up Action

The site visit team reaffirms that New York University meets the requirements for continued accreditation.

We expect that the institution will report on its progress in implementing both its own and the following team recommendations in its Periodic Review Report, but we do not consider its continued satisfaction of the standards of accreditation to be contingent on that progress.

NYU made a large number of recommendations with respect to advancing the four interdisciplinary fields; many of these focus on strengthening communication across the university and creating incentive structures that support collaboration across colleges. The team strongly endorses these recommendations.

We include here a summary of two recommendations and additional suggestions around the five standards selected for the Self-Study.

Suggestions regarding Standard 5: Administration:

- The Board of Trustees and the administration should maintain the elevated level and new mechanisms for consultation with the faculty and the university's other constituents.
- Particular attention should be paid to the search process for the next president. Consultation about the process and engagement by the university community in that process will be important.

Recommendations and suggestions regarding Standards 7: Institutional Assessment:

Recommendations:

- As noted in the Self-Study, the university has "initiated an extensive project on the use of quantitative metrics to track departmental and school-level progress in meeting academic, scholarly, and fiscal benchmarks." The team commends this effort and recommends that NYU continue to develop and implement these quantitative metrics and to evaluate and improve how colleges, schools, programs, and initiatives deploy this information in decision-making, evaluation and improvement.

- While there is clearly a considerable amount of data collected, it was not clear to the team how consistently these data are integrated into the strategic planning, resource allocation, and evaluation processes. The team recommends that the university more clearly articulate and demonstrate how this is consistently accomplished.

Suggestions:

- Given that the four multi-school, interdisciplinary initiatives highlighted in the Self-Study Report are at various points in the their individual development and evolution, the team suggests that learnings gleaned from the most advanced of these initiatives (e.g., GIPH, Magnet, Genomics), as noted in regards to Standards 5, 10 and 11, be intentionally translated and transmitted to those programs that are in earlier stages of development.

- Given the wealth of knowledge garnered by the Steering Committee in the development and writing of the Self-Study Report, especially as it relates to multi-school, interdisciplinary initiatives, the team suggests that NYU continue the momentum established in the Self-Study by developing a mechanism to maintain this level of knowledge exchange and to track progress towards building these cross-disciplinary fields.

Suggestions regarding Standard 9: Student Support:
- The team applauds the program review process operating in central student affairs and suggests that it continue.
- The visiting team suggests that ongoing attempts to improve undergraduate advising be pursued vigorously.
- The team suggests that NYU more fully integrate graduate courses, degree programs, and students into the GNU sites beyond New York.
- The team suggests that the university develop ways to make the housing process less bureaucratic and more student-friendly.
- The team found the efforts to attend to student mental health needs to be impressive and suggests that such efforts continue.

Suggestions regarding Standard 10: Faculty:
- NYU should consider formalizing the way in which faculty participation in centers, institutes, and multi-disciplinary themed areas is evaluated especially as it relates to tenure and promotion.

- NYU should consider faculty hiring within a theme based cluster approach thus building ties to both the themes and the departments they will ultimately be associated with and tenured in.

- NYU should use its articulated learning goals associated with each theme to identify the role that professors in the practice, adjuncts, and other non-tenured track appointments can play in achieving excellence in each of the themed areas.

- NYU should consider how to best use these multi-school inter-disciplinary programs as a vehicle to attract a diverse faculty especially in departments that have had difficulty achieving these goals on their own.

Suggestions regarding Standard 11: Educational Offerings:

- NYU should continue its efforts to enhance undergraduate academic advising, as described in the suggestions under Standard 9, in order to support increasing student interest in the multidisciplinary and cross-school programs
- NYU should consider formalizing the way in which faculty participation in centers, institutes and multi-disciplinary themed areas is evaluated in relation to tenure and promotion, as described in the suggestions under Section 10.
- NYU should seek to find ways in which its management of space and the IT infrastructure may better support multidisciplinary, non-departmental units and programs
- NYU should seek to strengthen its structural support for engaging undergraduates in faculty-mentored research and experiential learning in light of the Self-Study's account of the interdisciplinary programs and the apparent absence of any university-wide coordinating mechanism for such activities
- NYU should seek to strengthen its organizational and infrastructure support for faculty and students working in the interdisciplinary programs, and in particular for digital humanities
- NYU should address the confusion and/or concern among some faculty regarding the role and availability of Graduate Teaching Assistant support for certain types of course offerings.